This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B4780441
805
A13

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE

OF

Unitarian and Other Christian Churches.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWELFTH MEETING, HELD AT SARATOGA, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 20–24, 1886.

CONTENTS.

I. GENERAL REPORT.
II. REPORTS OF NATIONAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS.
III. RECEPTION OF FOREIGN DELEGATES.
IV. SERMON: THE DIVINE SUFFICIENCY.
V. RELIGION AND SCIENCE.
VI. CHURCH WORK AND LIFE.
VII. THE LABOR QUESTION.
VIII. THE DRINK QUESTION.
IX. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.
X. MUSIC AND RELIGION.
XI. OTHER REPORTS AND ADDRESSES.
XII. CONSTITUTION, BY-LAWS, LIST OF DELEGATES.

BOSTON:
GEO. H. ELLIS, PRINTER, 141 FRANKLIN STREET.
1886.

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

WITH

THE CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE CONFERENCE, AND A LIST OF THE DELEGATES.

This Report may be obtained at the following places: New York, by letter addressed to the General Secretary, Rev. Russell N. Bellows, 109 East 15th St.; Boston, The American Unitarian Association, 25 Beacon St.; Chicago, Charles H. Kerr & Co., 175 Dearborn St.; London, The British and Foreign Unitarian Association, Essex Hall, Strand.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED FOR THE CONFERENCE, BY THE GENERAL SECRETARY, REV. RUSSELL N. BELLOWS. ADDRESS, NO. 109 EAST 15TH STREET, NEW YORK, N.Y.

1886.

Hosted by Google

GEO. H. ELLIS, PRINTER, 141 FRANKLIN ST., BOSTON.

Hosted by Google

CONTENTS.

PAGE

OFFICERS AND STANDING COMMITTEES FOR 1886–88, ... 5

REPORTS.

GENERAL REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWELFTH MEETING. By Rev. Samuel J. Barrows, Editor of the *Christian Register*, ... 7

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL. By Rev. James De Normandie, Chairman, ... 17

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION. By Rev. Grindall Reynolds, Secretary, ... 22

REPORT OF THE WESTERN CONFERENCE. By Rev. John R. Effinger, Secretary, . . 26

REPORT OF STATE AND LOCAL CONFERENCES. By Rev. Trowbridge B. Forbush, of Milwaukee, ... 31

REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE CHURCH BUILDING LOAN FUND. By Rev. Howard N. Brown, Secretary, ... 36

REPORT OF THE UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY. By Rev. Henry G. Spaulding, Secretary, ... 39

REPORT OF THE WESTERN UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY. By Mrs. Ellen T. Leonard, Secretary, ... 42

RECEPTION OF FOREIGN DELEGATES.

REPORT OF ADDRESSES BY REV. GEORGE VANCE SMITH, D.D., MR. GEORGE WILLIAM RAYNER WOOD, AND REV. STOPFORD WENTWORTH BROOKE, DELEGATES FROM THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION; AND BY REV. ALFRED STEINTHAL, OF MANCHESTER, ENGLAND, ... 46

SERMON AND ESSAYS.

THE DIVINE SUFFICIENCY. The Opening Sermon before the Conference. By Rev. John W. Chadwick, of Brooklyn, ... 51

THE RELATION OF RELIGIOUS AND SCIENTIFIC THOUGHT AT THE PRESENT DAY:

OUR CHRISTIAN POSITION AS UNITARIANS. By Rev. G. Vance Smith, D.D., of Carmarthen, Wales, ... 62

THE FULNESS OF GOD. By Rev. Samuel R. Calthrop, of Syracuse, . . . 71

THE DIVINITY OF MAN. By Rev. Henry M. Simmons, of Minneapolis, . 83

IMMORTALITY AND MODERN THOUGHT. By Rev. Minot J. Savage, of Boston, ... 92

THE WORK AND LIFE OF THE CHURCH AT THE PRESENT DAY:

THE NEW ETHICS AND THE NEW PIETY. By Rev. Charles F. Dole, of Boston, ... 107

THE INTELLECTUAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. Joseph H. Crooker, of Madison, ... 116

Hosted by Google

THE CHARITABLE WORK OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. Edward E. Hale, D.D., of Boston. 122
THE MISSIONARY WORK OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. Jenkin Ll. Jones, of Chicago, ... 126
RELIGION IN ITS RELATION TO CAPITAL AND LABOR:
ARBITRATION AND ITS RELATION TO STRIKES. By William B. Weeden, of Providence, ... 134
THE PRESENT ACTUAL CONDITION OF THE WORKINGMAN. By Carroll D. Wright, of Boston, ... 145
THE DRINK QUESTION:
THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD THE DRAM-SHOP. By Judge Robert C. Pitman, of Newton, ... 155
THE EFFECT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES UPON THE HEALTH. By Francis Minot, M.D., of Boston, ... 166
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION:
THE INFLUENCES OF THE HOME. By Rev. Joseph May, of Philadelphia, 171
THE INFLUENCES OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. Brooke Herford, of Boston, 178
THE INFLUENCES OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL. By Rev. Seth C. Beach, of Dedham, ... 184
MUSIC AND RELIGION:
MUSIC AS A LANGUAGE OF RELIGION. By Rev. James Vila Blake, of Chicago, ... 189
CONGREGATIONAL SINGING. By Rev. Henry G. Spaulding, of Boston, . . 196
THE CHOIR. By Rev. William H. Lyon, of Boston, ... 202
THE ORGAN. By Arthur Foote, of Boston, ... 209

OTHER REPORTS AND ADDRESSES.

REPORT OF THE WOMEN'S AUXILIARY CONFERENCE. ADDRESSES ABOUT SOUTHERN AND INDIAN WORK:
OUR OPPORTUNITY IN THE SOUTH. By Rev. Amory D. Mayo, ... 221
THE ELEVATION OF THE NEGRO. By Prof. Booker T. Washington, . . 224
OUR SOUTHERN AND INDIAN EDUCATIONAL WORK. By Gen. J. F. B. Marshall, ... 227
THE LIBERAL HOLLAND CHURCH OF GRAND RAPIDS. Address by the pastor, Rev. F. W. N. Hugenholtz, ... 229
DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS: MEMORIAL OF THE UNITARIAN EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, ... 231
THE UNITARIAN CHURCH TEMPERANCE SOCIETY. ORGANIZATION, CONSTITUTION, OFFICERS, ... 233

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE, ... 235
LIST OF DELEGATES TO THE TWELFTH MEETING, ... 237

Hosted by Google

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

ORGANIZATION FOR 1886-88.

OFFICERS.

President.

SAMUEL F. MILLER, ... WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vice-Presidents.

JOHN D. LONG, ... HINGHAM, MASS.
GEORGE W. McCRARY, ... KANSAS CITY, MO.
DORMAN B. EATON, ... NEW YORK, N.Y.
DANIEL L. SHOREY, ... CHICAGO, ILL.
HORACE DAVIS, ... SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
GEORGE E. ADAMS, ... CHICAGO, ILL.

General Secretary.

REV. RUSSELL N. BELLOWS, ... NEW YORK, N.Y.

Treasurer.

WILLIAM HOWELL REED, ... BOSTON, MASS.

Council.

REV. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, *Chairman*, ... BOSTON, MASS.
MRS. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE, ... JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS.
MRS. MARY HEMENWAY, ... BOSTON, MASS.
REV. JENKIN LL. JONES, ... CHICAGO, ILL.
REV. MINOT J. SAVAGE, ... BOSTON, MASS.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, ... NEWTON, MASS.
REV. JOHN SNYDER, ... ST. LOUIS, MO.
JOHN HARSEN RHOADES, ... NEW YORK, N.Y.
THOMAS J. MORRIS, ... BALTIMORE, MD.
REV. BROOKE HERFORD, ... BOSTON, MASS.

AND THE GENERAL SECRETARY, *ex officio*.

Hosted by Google

COMMITTEE ON FELLOWSHIP.

Eastern States.

REV. CHARLES C. EVERETT, D.D., *Chairman*, ... CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
REV. AUGUSTUS WOODBURY, *Secretary*, ... PROVIDENCE, R.I.
REV. EDMUND B. WILLSON, ... SALEM, MASS.

Middle States.

REV. CHARLES G. AMES, ... PHILADELPHIA, PA.
REV. GEORGE W. CUTTER, ... BUFFALO, N.Y.
REV. THEODORE C. WILLIAMS, ... NEW YORK, N.Y.

Western States.

REV. JOHN R. EFFINGER, ... CHICAGO, ILL.
REV. JOHN C. LEARNED, ... ST. LOUIS, MO.
REV. JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND, ... ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Pacific States.

REV. THOMAS L. ELIOT, ... PORTLAND, ORE.
REV. HORATIO STEBBINS, ... SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
REV. CHARLES W. WENDTE, ... OAKLAND, CAL.

Hosted by Google

REPORTS.

GENERAL REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWELFTH MEETING.

THE twelfth session of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches was opened at Saratoga, N.Y., Sept. 20, 1886, in the First Methodist Episcopal Church.

The opening religious service was held at eight o'clock Monday evening, with sermon by Rev. John W. Chadwick, of Brooklyn. The subject was "The Divine Sufficiency."

TUESDAY.

The devotional meeting on Tuesday morning was conducted by Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D.

The Conference was formally called to order at 10 A.M. by the President, Hon. Samuel F. Miller, of Washington.

ADDRESS OF HON. SAMUEL F. MILLER.

Ladies and Gentlemen,— The twelfth meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches is now in session, and is now proposed to be organized. Two years ago the Conference did me the honor to elect me its president for the two years from that time, including this session. I regret that it did not select a more experienced and, in other respects perhaps, a more suitable presiding officer. I could not, however, decline, because of my interest in the objects of the Conference, because of my regard for the distinguished persons engaged in calling me to this place, and because I had declined once before to accept the nomination for the reason that I could not attend. So far as I represent the Conference, the delegates and others attending, I welcome you heartily in the name of the great Father to this Conference of Christian and religious people. I do not propose to make any protracted declaration of my devotion to the Unitarian cause or of the greatness and importance of that cause. I cannot refrain from saying that, in the Conferences which I have attended here before, the number and intelligence of the persons in attendance, whether delegates or voluntary persons coming to make a part of the audience and congregation, have been such as to command the respect of any enlightened, intelligent community. I know of no meeting, religious or secular, which brings to its interesting performances, and as witnesses and participants in those performances, a larger body of more integrity, purity of purpose, and intelligence than the Unitarian Conference, which for years has met at this place. I shall beg of you to bear with my imperfections as presiding officer, and to aid me in my difficulties. I am happy in the knowledge that predecessors in this position are here, upon

Hosted by Google

whose advice and experience I can rely, and in the belief that you will tolerate and forgive any imperfections on my part.

Prayer was offered by Rev. Grindall Reynolds. The following resolution, offered by Hon. Dorman B. Eaton, was adopted: —

Resolved, That all motions and resolutions, not merely of a formal or incidental character, which propose any action or declaration on the part of the Conference, shall, unless the Conference shall otherwise specifically order, be referred without debate to the Chairman of the Committee on Business, whose duty it shall be to make seasonable reports thereon. In case any action by the Conference shall be recommended in a report, a suitable time for the same shall be therein designated. And, unless objection shall be made to any report, it shall be deemed approved by the Conference.

It was moved and adopted that the Committees on Credentials, Business, and Nominations be appointed by the Chair. The following appointments were then made: —

Committee on Credentials: William H. Baldwin, of Boston; Rev. J. Edward Wright, of Montpelier; J. W. Willard, of Cleveland.

Committee on Business: Rev. J. F. Moors, D.D., of Boston; Hon. D. L. Shorey, of Chicago; Rev. T. B. Forbush, of Milwaukee; Isaac H. Cary, of Brooklyn; Thomas P. Galvin, of Germantown; Rev. Loammi G. Ware, of Burlington.

Committee on Nominations: Hon. John Lowell, of Boston; Rev. J. F. Clarke, of Boston; Rev. John Snyder, of St. Louis; Rev. J. Vila Blake, of Chicago; Rev. George Batchelor, of Wellesley Hills, Mass.; William B. Weeden, of Providence; Rev. Theodore C. Williams, of New York.

Assistant Secretaries: Rev. William H. Lyon, of Boston; Rev. Pitt Dillingham, of Boston; Rev. A. E. Goodnough, of Ithaca; Miss E. H. Bailey, of Boston.

The report of the Council was then read by the Chairman of the Council, Rev. James De Normandie. On motion of James Freeman Clarke, seconded by Rev. M. J. Savage, the report was adopted.

The President: I have the honor to present to your view and to your affection a gentleman who has adopted the great modern and wise plan of giving while he lives, thereby giving something that is his, and not that over which he has lost control.

The President then presented Mr. Enoch Pratt, of Baltimore, the giver of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, whose generosity was recognized in the council report. Mr. Pratt was received with great applause.

REMARKS OF ENOCH PRATT.

It is not becoming in me to make any speech. My speech has already been made, I believe, for these last two or three years very conclusively. But I wish to say that I am proud to acknowledge that I have been a member of this Unitarian denomination since I was fifteen years old, and have been a very active working member. If I have done anything to carry forward the views of our denomination in the advancement and the help of mankind, I feel great satisfaction in having it done while I am here, and to superintend it, and to see it is properly carried out, rather than to send it out to a committee from my tomb. Such a plan as that, as we all know, has generally failed of the purpose which the donors expected to have carried out. But in my case, up to this time, I am very proud to say that the results have been extraordinary; and I feel the satisfaction that I have done, perhaps, my duty, so far as called upon to render it. [Applause.]

Hosted by Google

The report of the American Unitarian Association was then read by the Secretary, Rev. Grindall Reynolds. The report closed with the following resolutions: —

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Conference, the church building of the Unitarian Society in Charleston, S.C., should be restored at the earliest possible date.

Resolved, That, to obtain the necessary funds, a time shall be given to receive individual subscriptions at such session of this Conference as the Committee on Business may determine.

Resolved, That *all* our churches be requested to take up a collection for this object, and, if possible within two weeks of the adjournment of this Conference.

Resolved, That the sums thus obtained shall be placed in the treasury of the American Unitarian Association; and, if more than is necessary for the purpose shall be given, the surplus shall be put to the credit of the Church Building Loan Fund.

Adopted.

The report of the Western Conference was read by Rev. J. R. Effinger, Secretary.

The report of the Trustees of the Church Building Loan Fund was read by Rev. H. N. Brown, Secretary.

Rev. Brooke Herford wished to supplement the report of the Committee of the Loan Building Fund with a few words. He would present two points,— one of advice to the churches as to the matters which call for the help of this Building Loan Fund. He wished to emphasize very earnestly the fact that, if our new churches all through the country are to be built, they must be more content than they are at present to exercise self-denial, and not to wish to do the whole thing at once. He was in favor of having every church build upon a scale which would leave room for the growth and development of the congregation into a self-supporting society. Churches came before them with applications which they were obliged to cut down considerably, to their great grief and trouble. Occasionally, it happened, as in the case of Topeka, that they asked for $3,500; and, when the amount was granted, they went on with their own collection, and finally drew from us only $2,400. Churches should be built so that they might enlarge to such an extent as their growth may require.

Another point was in regard to the funds. A few hundreds are still needed to make up the clear $20,000 before the whole collection will be made. He had no doubt that a good many of the wealthy friends in the audience had put this fund down in their wills. He did not want them to die, but the fund needed some of that money now. They could not put a little money into a better thing than into this cause.

Mr. Thomas Talbot, of Brookline, offered the following resolution: —

Voted, That a committee of three be appointed by the Chair to inquire how religious influence can be most efficiently exerted by this denomination to promote the civilization and elevation of our fellow-citizens in the Southern States, of African descent That this action be communicated to the American Unitarian Association, with the request that that body will add four members to this committee, in which case this committee will act as a joint committee. The committee is authorized to report to the American Unitarian Association, and at its next meeting to the Conference.

Rev. C. F. Dole offered the following resolution: —

Resolved, That, in view of the large needs of money for missionary purposes, and the full and excellent reports of the Conference given in the *Christian Register*, it is deemed unnecessary to incur the expense of publishing a special report.

Both these resolutions were referred to the Business Committee.

The remainder of the morning session was given to the reception of foreign delegates.

Hosted by Google

The Conference took a recess until 3.30 P.M.

The Conference was called to order at 3.30 P.M., the President in the chair.

Rev. Trowbridge B. Forbush, of Milwaukee, read a report on State and local conferences. The essay was discussed by Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D., Rev. J. H. Crooker, Rev. G. W. Gallagher, Rev. S. C. Beane, and Rev. J. F. Moors, D.D.

The report of the Unitarian Sunday School Society was read by Rev. H. G. Spaulding, Secretary.

The report of the Western Sunday School Society was read by Mrs. Ellen T. Leonard, Secretary.

The Business Committee reported adversely to the resolution offered by Mr. Dole to abandon the practice of printing the proceedings of the Conference. In regard to the resolution of Mr. Talbot, it reported that, inasmuch as the Unitarian Association has all the necessary machinery for doing the work, it is hardly necessary to increase it.

The Conference took a recess until evening.

The Conference resumed its session at 7.30 P.M., Rev. James De Normandie in the chair. Rev. Grindall Reynolds, Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, was the first speaker. Mr. Reynolds said he should have been glad to talk upon the general needs of the Association, but the Business Committee this morning referred the matter of Charleston to this time and to him; and there are times when we have to put aside the business that is closest to us and do the work for others that comes to us at this hour, which pre-eminently is the work of helping our brothers at Charleston. This work appeals to our sound judgment, demanding to be done. Mr. Reynolds spoke of the importance of rebuilding this church, it being one of only six Unitarian churches in the vast region of the South. This Charleston church, the very building that has been destroyed, is over one hundred years old, and dates many years back of the separation which took place between the two wings of the Congregational body in the early part of this century. The church has stood manfully and in a dignified manner in its faith; and the society, though few in numbers and limited in their resources, have asked no help outside of their own resources. He did not know where we could find in the Unitarian denomination a society that has stood more manfully, with more dignity and generous spirit, to their work. Never had he found a society that had appealed more to his sympathy. Mr. Reynolds spoke of the loss the church had sustained by the earthquake. It was the duty of the three hundred and fifty churches of our faith to rebuild the Charleston church.

A subscription was then opened, Mr. Enoch Pratt, of the Unitarian church at Baltimore, starting it with $500. The roll of the churches was called by the Chairman, and the responses soon became generous and rapid. More than $500 was taken in the boxes, and the amount obtained by subscription and collection reached nearly $11,000.

The amount originally asked for was $10,000; but, as the sum obtained exceeded it, Rev. J. Vila Blake moved that every cent of the money contributed, or hereafter to be obtained by appeals to the churches, shall go to the church at Charleston, and that the motion be now acted upon without submitting it to the Business Committee. The resolution was passed.

The lateness of the hour permitted only one other of the addresses mentioned on the programme; namely, an address by Prof. Booker T. Washington, Principal of Tuskegee Normal School.

Hosted by Google

WEDNESDAY.

The devotional meeting was conducted by Rev. S. M. Crothers, of Brattleboro. Four papers were read upon "The Relation of Religious and Scientific Thought at the Present Day": (1) "Our Christian Position," Rev. G. Vance Smith, D.D., of Wales; (2) "The Fulness of God," Rev. Samuel R. Calthrop, of Syracuse; (3) "The Divinity of Man," Rev. Henry M. Simmons, of Minneapolis; (4) "Immortality and Modern Thought," Rev. Minot J. Savage, of Boston. The Conference took a recess at 1.15 P.M.

At 3.30 was held the public meeting of the Women's Auxiliary Conference. Addresses and reports were made by the President and Secretary; by Mrs. J. L. Bagg, of Syracuse, on "The Duties and Responsibilities of the Women of Unitarian Churches"; by Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, of Dorchester, on "The Work of the Suffolk Branches of the Women's Auxiliary Conference"; by Mrs. E. A. West, of Chicago, and others.

At the evening session, four papers were read upon "The Work and Life of the Church at the Present Day": (1) "The New Ethics and the New Piety," Rev. Charles F. Dole, of Boston; (2) "The Intellectual Work of the Church," Rev. Joseph H. Crooker, of Madison; (3) "The Charitable Work of the Church," Rev. Edward E. Hale, D.D., of Boston; (4) "The Missionary Work of the Church," Rev. Jenkin Ll. Jones, of Chicago. Rev. A. D. Mayo also read a paper on "Southern Educational Work."

THURSDAY.

The devotional meeting was led by Rev. T. R. Slicer, of Providence.

The Conference was called to order at 10.30 A.M. by the President.

Rev. S. C. Beane read a memorial from the Unitarian Educational Society of New Hampshire, on the subject of denominational schools.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The Committee on Nominations reported the following names of officers for the next two years: —

President, Samuel F. Miller, Washington, D.C. Vice-Presidents, John D. Long, Hingham, Mass.; George W. McCrary, Kansas City, Mo.; Dorman B. Eaton, New York, N.Y.; Daniel L. Shorey, Chicago, Ill.; Horace Davis, San Francisco, Cal.; George E. Adams, Chicago, Ill. General Secretary, Rev. Russell N. Bellows, New York, N.Y. Treasurer, Wm. Howell Reed, Boston, Mass. Council, Rev. James De Normandie, Boston (Roxbury), Mass.; Mrs. James Freeman Clarke, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Mrs. Mary Hemenway, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Jenkin Ll. Jones, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Minot J. Savage, Boston, Mass.; Leverett Saltonstall, Newton, Mass.; Rev. John Snyder, St. Louis, Mo.; John Harsen Rhoades, New York, N.Y.; Thomas J. Morris, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Brooke Herford, Boston, Mass.

Committees on Fellowship, Eastern States: Rev. C. C. Everett, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Edmund B. Willson, Salem, Mass.; Rev. Augustus Woodbury, Providence, R.I.

Middle States: Rev. George W. Cutter, Buffalo, N.Y.; Rev. Charles G. Ames, Philadelphia, Penn.; Rev. Theo. C. Williams, New York, N.Y.

Western States: Rev. J. T. Sunderland, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Rev. John R. Effinger, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. John C. Learned, St. Louis, Mo.

Pacific States: Rev. Horatio Stebbins, San Francisco, Cal.; Rev. Thomas L. Eliot, Portland, Ore.; Rev. Charles W. Wendte, Oakland, Cal.

The report was accepted and the ticket elected by acclamation.

Judge Miller: In accepting a re-election, I shall best justify the confidence which the Conference has reposed in me in this re-election by taking none of its time uselessly in expressing my gratification at this vote; but I must say that,

Hosted by Google

considering how new I have been to this species of work, considering the great number in this audience who have been present, considering the subjects that have been before it and the interest manifested in these subjects, the Conference needs very little government. I thank you for your expression of kindness and confidence and for the order which has been kept in the Conference.

Rev. J. Ll. Jones, representing the Council, presented Rev. F. W. Hugenholtz, of the Liberal Holland Society of Grand Rapids, Mich., who made an address. Immediately following Mr. Hugenholtz's address, a collection was taken for the completion of the church building of his society. The amount required — $1,000 — was soon subscribed; and the sum of $867.64 was collected on the spot.

Mr. W. H. Baldwin: I received this morning a despatch from our friend, Rev. E. C. L. Browne, which I will read to you, first reading the despatch sent to him: —

UNITED STATES HOTEL, SARATOGA SPRINGS, N.Y.
Sept. 21, 1886.

REV. E. C. L. BROWNE, CHARLESTON, S.C.:

The Unitarian Conference assembled at Saratoga sends its hearty sympathy to the Unitarian church in Charleston, and the happy announcement that the churches and individuals have this evening pledged over $11,000 in aid of rebuilding your church edifice.

(Signed) WILLIAM H. BALDWIN,
For the Conference.

The following response was received: —

CHARLESTON, S.C., Sept. 23, 1886.

WILLIAM H. BALDWIN:

"Why art thou cast down, O my soul? Hope thou in God." May the faith of our friends, saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid, be warranted, as by the steadfastness of this church in the past, so by its growth and fruitage in the future!

(Signed) E. C. L. BROWNE.

Two papers were read, as follows: —

(1) "Arbitration and its Relation to Strikes," by Mr. William B. Weeden, of Providence.

(2) "The Present Actual Condition of the Workingman," by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, of Boston.

These papers were followed by remarks by Hon. David A. Wells, of Norwich, Conn. *Recess.*

The Conference reassembled at 3.30 P.M., Judge Miller presiding.

Papers were read, as follows: —

(1) "The Attitude of the Church toward the Dram-shop," by Judge Robert C. Pitman, of Newton, Mass.

(2) "The Effects of Alcoholic Beverages upon the Health," by Francis Minot, M.D., of Boston. *Recess.*

At the evening session, Gen. J. F. B. Marshall made a statement of the work of the Southern and Indian Educational Bureau of the American Unitarian Association, with special reference to the work and needs of the new mission to the Crow Indians, under charge of Rev. H. F. Bond.

Rev. Joseph May, of Philadelphia, read the first of four papers upon Religious Education. His topic was "The Influence of the Home."

The following telegram was received: —

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITARIAN CONFERENCE:

Thanks for your noble gift.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HOLLAND LIBERAL CHURCH.

Hosted by Google

The pastor of the church, Rev. F. W. Hugenholtz, desired an opportunity to present his thanks, and spoke as follows: —

Rev. F. W. Hugenholtz: I am very glad that my people in Grand Rapids did their duty. Now let me do mine. If I ever could wish to be eloquent, I should wish it to-day; and, if I ever felt that the fulfilment of that wish must be denied me, it is to-day. So, without eloquence, let me bring you my hearty thanks for what you did to-day. Let me thank you in the name of my congregation at Grand Rapids, whose church building now is secured,— nay, more than that,— whose future is secured by that church. Let me thank you in the name of my master and friend, Dr. Kuenen, who, if he reads my letter which I shall write to him as soon as possible, will read there what his name alone can do and did this day at the Conference at Saratoga; and he will have a happy day, too. But, most of all, I will never forget that deeds are better than words; and so I promise that I will do my utmost best to make these thousand dollars give fruits — thirty and sixty and a hundred-fold fruits — for our glorious liberal faith, for religious freedom and religious truth, that will pay the best recompense for you all. May God bless you for the work that you have done to-day,— the work of love and fellowship! May God bless us all in work that we have to do as long as our working day lights over us and gives us our task!

The second and third papers upon Religious Education were read by Revs. Brooke Herford, of Boston, and S. C. Beach, of Dedham. Mr. Herford discussed "The Influence of the Church," Mr. Beach "The Influence of the Sunday-school."

The following telegram was received from Dr. Rose, responding for the Unitarians of Charleston, S.C.: —

In the name of the Unitarians of Charleston, I return their grateful acknowledgment to the Conference for its sympathy and practical aid in our great misfortunes.

Mr. James MacAllister, who was to have read a paper on "The Influences of the Public School," was unable to be present.

FRIDAY.

The devotional meeting was led by Rev. Henry W. Foote.

The Conference was called to order at 10 A.M., the President in the chair.

The Business Committee reported favorably the following resolutions. A resolution by Rev. Lyman Clark: —

Resolved, That the Unitarian Sunday School Society is recommended to consider the desirability of the selection or preparation of a manual suitable for the purpose of giving temperance instruction in our Sunday-schools, and take such action as may appear to be practicable.

Adopted.

A resolution offered by Rev. H. W. Foote was amended by the committee, and reported as follows: —

Resolved, That this Conference respectfully ask Congress to make provision by a suitable appropriation for the collection of statistics concerning the subject of Marriage and Divorce in the different States, and in the Territories and the District of Columbia, so that sufficient data may be collected as a basis for required legislation on the subject.

Adopted.

Hosted by Google

A resolution offered by Rev. S. C. Beane: —

Resolved, That a committee of ten be appointed by the Chair to take into consideration the subject of Denominational Schools, which committee shall report to the Conference at its next biennial meeting, and shall also be authorized to communicate its recommendations at any time to our religious body by such means as it may select.

Adopted.

The President announced the following Committee on Denominational Schools: —

Rev. Edward E. Hale, Boston; Rev Calvin Stebbins, Worcester; Gov. George D. Robinson, Chicopee; Rev. Mary A. Safford, Sioux City, Ia.; Rev. S. C. Beane, Salem; Prof. Ephraim Emerton, Cambridge; Prof. William F. Allen, Madison, Wis.; Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, Boston; Rev. J. C. Learned, St. Louis; Rev. S. R. Calthrop, Syracuse, N.Y.

Four papers upon Music and Religion were given, as follows: —

(1) "Music as a Language of Religion," by Rev. James Vila Blake, of Chicago.

(2) "Congregational Singing," by Rev. Henry G. Spaulding, of Boston.

(3) "The Choir," by Rev. William H. Lyon, of Boston.

(4) "The Organ," by Mr. Arthur Foote, of Boston.

A resolution offered by Rev. S. J. Barrows was reported favorably by the Business Committee: —

Resolved, That this Conference express its grateful appreciation of the long, self-sacrificing, and devoted service of the late Rev. C. H. A. Dall in the India Mission, and its conviction that the work thus begun ought not to be abandoned.

Resolved, That, in reorganizing its foreign missionary work, the American Unitarian Association be urged to consider what active steps may be taken for co-operation with the Brahmo Somaj for such ends as the two organizations may have in common.

Adopted.

Rev. S. J. Barrows spoke briefly concerning the previous resolution. He thought justice had not been done to Mr. Dall for the sacrifice and devotion he had exhibited in his work in India. He had planted his work there on an educational basis. In this he had acted wisely. He had early introduced industrial education in connection with his moral and religious work. But one great feature of his career in India had been almost overlooked. Scarcely any mention was made of it in the tributes paid to him; namely, the catholicity of his spirit, which induced him to join the Brahmo Somaj. Mr. Dall showed a hospitable spirit in wishing to join it, and the Brahmo Somaj showed a hospitable spirit in admitting him. For this, Mr. Dall had been criticised. But a few years ago Mr. Mozoomdar came to this country, and with words of living fire told us what that organization was doing in the love of God and humanity. Then we understood better the significance of Mr. Dall's act. It was a touching scene at the grave of this venerable brother that a Sister of Charity, a Methodist preacher, and a member of the Brahmo Somaj should all unite in paying their tribute to his life. Referring, then, to the clause of the resolution urging the American Unitarian Association to take steps to co-operate with the Brahmo Somaj, Mr. Barrows said that we had reached a new epoch in our missionary work. There is an opportunity now to join hands with this liberal native organization in its noble work of social reform,— in elevating the condition of women, in relieving them from the great evils of child marriage and prolonged widowhood, in giving to girls the opportunity for a better education, in resisting the encroachments of European vices, particularly intemperance, and in advancing the grand ideas of love to God and love to man.

Hosted by Google

In conclusion, the speaker referred to the hospitality of the present National Conference. It had warmly welcomed delegates from Great Britain; it had extended its hand generously to Brother Hugenholtz, a representative of the Liberal Holland Union; it had listened to glowing words from a member of the colored race; it had heard Gen. Marshall's appeal for the education of the Indians; and now it had extended a sympathetic hand to the Brahmo Somaj. He hoped the time would come when this gathering would be not only a National Conference, but an international one; when every liberal religious movement in all the great countries of the world would be represented at its meetings, and he hoped the Brahmo Somaj would be among them. This would be simply carrying out the hospitality represented in that primitive Christian idea that "God hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth"; "that God is no respecter of persons, and in every nation he that worketh righteousness is accepted of him."

The following resolutions were offered by Prof. H. H. Barber: —

Resolved, That this Conference recalls with regard and honor the memory of Henry P. Kidder, from its organization a loyal member and often an officer of this body, a devoted worker in our Church and in every good cause of his city, his country, and for humanity, and rejoices to find in the simple Christian consecration, which was the secret of his manful and helpful life, an incitement and inspiration for the humane and religious enterprises that are before us.

Adopted.

Resolved, That the hearty thanks of the Conference and its great indebtedness be expressed to Mr. Eben A. Kelly, for his voluntary and able services on the organ.

Adopted.

Offered by Rev. A. M. Judy: —

Resolved, That we recognize the kindness and courtesy of the special correspondents and representatives of the press, especially of the *Christian Register* and the *Saratogian*, for their full and careful reports of our meetings.

Offered by W. H. Baldwin: —

Resolved, That the thanks of this Conference be presented to the President and other officers for their prompt and efficient attention to the continuous work of the Conference.

The Committee on Credentials take pleasure in submitting the following report: —

Total number of delegates, 603; churches, societies, and organizations represented, 267.

Careful estimates of the full number of delegates, and also of members of the Unitarian societies in different sections of the country, show that about from 2,200 to 2,300 have been present at the Conference.

Delegates and friends have attended the Conference from Great Britain, Canada, and we may say from every section of the United States, — from California, New Orleans, Charleston, S.C., Kansas, Colorado, and the extreme East.

WM. H. BALDWIN,
Rev. J. E. WRIGHT,
J. W. WILLARD,
} *Committee.*

The Secretary announced that a letter had been received from the Representative Consistory of Hungarian Unitarians, signed by Joseph Ferencz, Bishop of the Unitarian Church in Hungary, congratulating the Conference upon its influence and achievements, and sending fraternal greetings in the name of Hungarian

Hosted by Google

Unitarians. It was moved that the Council be authorized to return an appropriate reply.

Rev. Samuel May: I have learned how much we are indebted for this string of pearls to the gentleman whose earnest labor for six months has brought this great result to pass. I feel that we need to recognize especially the labors of the Secretary, Mr. Bellows.

These remarks were followed by loud applause.

Judge Miller: I do not think the sentiment of the audience needs further explanation on this subject. [Applause.]

Judge Miller then made the following closing address, announcing the adjournment of the Conference.

CLOSING ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT.

It becomes my duty to announce the dissolution of the Twelfth Conference of the American Unitarian and Other Christian Churches. These biennial conferences, which now amount to twelve and to twenty-four years' duration, have grown in importance, in interest, and in value from the first. There are those in this congregation who have attended them all, who are prepared to say that in point of numbers, in point of interest, in point of value for its proceedings, this one does not fall behind any of its predecessors. I take pleasure in stating that, as a body, its papers, its discussions, its resolutions, its actions, will have an important bearing upon moral thought and conduct, through this union, for the future. As a body of learned, wise, considerate people, I am proud to have been its presiding officer.

First, while I say this much of the body proper,— the Unitarian Conference composed of the delegates who have entered into its purposes,— I must also say that, in association with that, the people, ladies and gentlemen, who have attended as outsiders, have by their orderly conduct, their appreciation of what was done, their unwearied attendance upon sessions, both of worship and business, added to its character and its results.

We are about to be dissolved as a body, but we are not dissolved as individuals. We are not, I mean, discharged of the personal duties which each and all of us owe to the matters and subjects which have brought us together. The food for thought which has been poured into our minds by the essays and discussions and the resolutions must operate upon each individual; and, though we cannot, probably, and shall not again assemble for two years as a distinct body, I feel assured that each and every member and each and every attendant will carry with him the resolutions and purposes, and give in his own neighborhood and in the sphere of his own influence expression to all that has been said and thought. Now that we are about to separate, except that you will have a most excellent sermon, as I know from the character of the gentleman who is to deliver it, and that we shall all meet socially at the United States parlors this evening,— with this exception, I have to part with you, and do so with both sorrow and pleasure, and to wish you happy and pleasant journeys home and a safe and loving meeting with the hearts you have left behind. This body is adjourned.

In the evening, the closing sermon was delivered by Rev. John Snyder, of St. Louis, on "Unexpected Blessings."

A Reception followed in the parlors of the United States Hotel.

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

BY REV. JAMES DE NORMANDIE, CHAIRMAN.

THE Council has the honor to submit the following report to the twelfth meeting of the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches: —

The only instruction committed to us by the last Conference was that we should draft a letter to be sent to the various societies in Europe which have been represented on this platform, and, if possible, to secure a delegation to represent it at the next meeting of the National Conference in England and at the meeting of the Protestanten Verein.

The Council has attended to this instruction in part, not by a letter missive, but by such correspondence as was possible to carry out the intention of that motion. We were represented at the English Conference, but found it impossible to have any delegates at the meeting of the Protestanten Verein. More active measures must be taken to establish a fellowship with all liberal religious organizations. The welcome is hearty on every hand, and the desire for active co-operation in thought and work; but representation must not be left to a chance traveller who may be induced to attend these meetings. It will be necessary to have a wider knowledge of those who may be induced to go because they are chosen representatives,— men who have done something and stand for something in the cause, who are able to present it with some effectiveness in a representative gathering, and, most important of all, that in some cases a part or the whole of their expenses should be paid. We believe that the door is here opened for a great advancement of the liberal cause, and we shall endeavor to carry the matter to further issues by our next session.

With this exception, no resolution was submitted to us. We have had, on account of the wide distances which separated us, few meetings. Our duties have been light, and few opportunities of any public nature have been presented to us by which we could forward the interests of our churches. It therefore remains for us to confine ourselves to those incidents in the past two years which have been of denominational importance, and to press upon you some suggestions for that increased activity which alone can justify our existence as a branch of the Christian Church Universal.

The Council desires, in the first place, to offer the congratulations of the Conference to the Unitarian Club of Boston that, through its efforts, a most substantial, convenient, and beautiful building has been erected and *paid for*, as the head-quarters of American Unitarianism. Gibbon calls St. Peter's "the most glorious structure that ever has been applied to the use of religion." We believe this building is the finest that ever has been built and dedicated to the business purposes of a Christian denomination. We rejoice at its completion. We rejoice that the formation of the Unitarian Club — in what is and surely, for our day, always will be the Jerusalem of our churches — was signalized by so worthy an enterprise, so successfully carried out.

We give the thanks of the National Conference to the members of that club who have shown so much denominational interest and generosity; and, now that

Hosted by Google

that worthy object has been attained, we trust it may be only an incentive to them and to all similar organizations to take up from time to time some other object, as soon as one is successfully completed, so that no year may be without its special interest, so that the desire for doing some active work "may grow by what it feeds upon," and that there may be no pause and no weariness in zeal or in generosity.

So fine a building is a silent but unceasing appeal to wider and more unflagging energies in the truth and the work which reared its walls. If we slumber or are indifferent now, because our faith has at last found so fitting a shelter, those walls will be but a reproachful monument to a cause of which we were not worthy, and of a work for humanity which some more faithful hearts must carry out. When Solomon had finished his golden temple, arranged the stately worship and the gorgeous ritual, his earlier zeal and consecration were lost in formalism. Let it not be so with us. Long may those walls stand to further with ever-increasing activity the object for which the American Unitarian Association was formed,— "to diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure Christianity"; and when it is no longer a temple for the advancement, but a tomb for the confinement, of the highest interpretation of Christian truth, may its deserted rooms and its mouldering stones be a melancholy witness of the fate which inevitably overtakes all organizations or institutions when an earnest enthusiasm and a deep faith in the spiritual realities have been exchanged for an easy indifference or a fear of progress or a questioning lest the spirit of God may have left the soul of man!

If the Unitarian Club of Boston could carry out so worthy an object, is it not the best reason to be offered for the formation of such a club in every city or neighborhood where there are two or three of our churches, so that their members may meet once a month for social life, for the discussion of theological questions, and the inauguration of missionary work?

The completion of this building was attended by but one bitter reflection,— the death of the moving spirit in its beginning and progress. We miss to-day one of the most constant and interested delegates to this Conference, at different times for several years one of its officers; and in the loss of Henry P. Kidder, so fresh and heavy to many of us, we mourn a most active and generous supporter of every denominational work, a banker of the sternest integrity, a business counsellor of the greatest wisdom, a philanthropist of unknown and unlimited and unceasing benefactions, a friend of tenderest sympathy, a genial, courteous, benignant character, actuated by the highest religious motives and the simplest religious trust.

Although the new Unitarian Building is perhaps the most important denominational work completed since our last session in this place, the Council has great pleasure in reminding the Conference of a gift which, for public interest and for individual munificence, far surpasses anything this body has been privileged to record. In a letter dated Jan. 22, 1882, Mr. Enoch Pratt informed the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore that it was his purpose to establish a free library for the use of its citizens. On the 2d of July, 1883, he sent to that body a check for $833,333.33, making his total contribution for this long-cherished purpose the more than imperial sum of $1,145,833.33; and on Monday, Jan. 4, 1886, this New Year's gift to his beloved city was opened and dedicated to its uses for future generations. In his modest remarks at these services, Mr. Pratt said: "It may be proper for me to more fully explain my meaning of a free circulating

Hosted by Google

library. It is not free for you to take the books as you please, and return them or not; but it is free from charge for the use of them." It may be a question as to the benefit which this universal and omnivorous habit of reading is conferring upon our generation, or to any young person to have an unrestricted access to books without regard to their character. There can be no question of the help which *good* books may be, used under a wise direction. We know this is the desire of the founder of this institution. We trust that his vast and perennial generosity may never be betrayed into the furnishing of an impure or sensational literature. Then will it prove one of the grandest offerings of any single citizen to the good of this country. We rejoice to number so eminent a philanthropist among our members, that he has been so frequently a delegate to this Conference, that he is with us to-day.

And when with this gift we associate the name of Thomas Whitridge, who left the largest legacy the American Unitarian Association has ever received,— the sum of one hundred thousand dollars,— we congratulate the city which is so rich in men who have put their liberal faith into such humanitarian works. We congratulate the church which can number two such benefactors among its honored members.

Baltimore suggests another name prominent in a very different way in our denominational interest. It was there that Rev. Charles H. A. Dall was born, Feb. 12, 1816. In quest of health, he went to India in 1855, at the earnest entreaty of Rev. Charles T. Brooks, who had just returned from a visit to that land and to Mr. Roberts, the son of a native Christian teacher, who was carrying on a little church in the Unitarian faith. From that time until last July, Mr. Dall has been engaged in this Indian mission with an earnestness, faithfulness, and consecration rarely equalled. This body has not known much about this work. It may be confessed it has never had much interest in it, because the motives which lead other religious bodies to foreign missionary enterprises are not active with us. But those who have made any inquiry have known that here a faithful messenger and servant of God was doing his work, and that, in India or in Boston, that work was not in vain. So year by year the Association has made its appropriations, and year by year the details of the mission have come back to us. As he began, he continued by laying stress upon school work, upon secular and industrial education, as the best method of bringing a higher life to these people; and no one who has read Mr. Arnold's remarkable descriptions of this land, its worship and its civilization, in his *India Revisited*, can doubt that there is vast room for the introduction of some higher life, and that just in this direction there is a loud call for us to carry on and increase this work. In a report on the India Mission made to this Conference in 1872, it was stated that, in all, about three thousand one hundred and seventy persons were the recipients of Mr. Dall's teaching or help and the objects of his personal interest and care. The school has been larger since then, and his influence has never waned. At his funeral last summer, a vast concourse of natives bowed low over his remains. Some cast garlands of jessamine into the grave; and some members of the Brahmo Somaj made a request to offer prayer above it,— all the willing, heart-felt testimony to a life of unfaltering devotion.

The Council desires to emphasize the suggestion, made again and again by its predecessors in office, of the importance of arousing increased interest in the Local Conferences and in the appointment of State missionaries. There seems no other way by which our cause can be so well sustained and so wisely spread.

Hosted by Google

And this brings us to the old question which will never down, until we have lost all zeal for our faith or until that faith becomes a more common possession. It must be an utter apathy, or an indifference and blindness to the great and comforting views of the divine nature and order, of the conditions of the future based upon character here, which are so familiar to us, that can make us so lukewarm while multitudes are surely ready for these truths; or, still worse, if bound fast by the fears of a partial and cruel God, by false views of Scripture and of human nature, which are really at the bottom of a vast portion of our social evils and unrest. It is singular how much more tender are *our* consciences, or greater our lack of religious ardor upon this whole subject of missionary work, than in those days all through, when the most enlightened and most spiritual and most philanthropical — yea, all who felt they had some message of truth by which humanity was to be helped — could give themselves no rest until they imparted it, — yes, and not only verbally imparted it, but zealously enforced it upon others. That is the supremest selfishness which cherishes a grand and helpful religious truth for our own satisfaction. The fact is that wherever there is not an utter grave of all truth, of all thought, of all noble enterprises to help humanity, there must be an active, organized missionary spirit. You wait and wait, out of a false idea that your child and that young person must not be influenced in their religious opinions, that they must think and decide for themselves; and while you wait, afraid of announcing or insisting upon your views, these young minds are seized upon by those all around them who are not indifferent, by those who have more enthusiasm, by those who have more organizing and more missionary spirit, by those who are ready to *do* something for their faith, and become the rightful prizes to those sects whose views you do not approve. But their doctrines, with some appearance of reasonableness and Scriptural arguments, have taken root in the kindly soil of impressible youth, and can be outgrown and weeded out only by long years of struggle and agony. It is cause for unspeakable regret — it ought to be for bitter reproach — that, while our views in regard to the interpretation of the Scriptures, of the attributes of Deity, and of the capabilities and destiny of man, of righteousness as the end of all worship, are being rapidly approached by the leading preachers and teachers of all denominations, and not only approached, but wholly appropriated; not only assented to in the confidential conversation, but unhesitatingly proclaimed from a thousand pulpits,— we have not been able to organize them ourselves into a great living and beneficent Church. It can be done only by cultivating a missionary spirit.

To support these State missionaries, the pressing exigency is that our churches should double — yea, and fourfold increase — their contributions to the American Unitarian Association. We need no new agent or treasury. The Council is of that deliberate conviction, again and again expressed to this body. That organization stands ready, with all its means, with the heartiest sympathy, and with the broadest fellowship, to further every plan the Conference may propose, to the last cent in its treasury. We stand upon the same foundation. We have the same historical inheritances. We are working for the same religious ends; and we do not propose that any side issues or any transient controversies shall turn us from that foundation, from those inheritances, or from those ends. All that we ask and plead for is, on the part of all our individuals and churches, a more earnest missionary spirit and more thoroughly organized and liberal contributions.

The Council marks with great satisfaction the increased interest our body is

Hosted by Google

taking in the cause of temperance. One of the sessions of this Conference will be devoted to that subject. We trust its importance will be more fully recognized at each succeeding meeting, until we are acknowledged as leaders in this work; for we have no place as a church, unless we are. A church which pleads for character should be instant, in season and out of season, to remove every social evil by which character is degraded and ruined.

A subject of the greatest importance, which has been discussed two or three times at our National Conference, has taken such shape that the Council feels compelled to ask for it the most careful consideration from our churches, that, when the time comes for them to pronounce judgment, it may be with carefulness, with preparation, and with wisdom. At the last Anniversary of the American Unitarian Association in Boston, the question of a liturgy was considered, with more direct results than ever before. At the next meeting of its directors, it is quite probable a committee will be appointed, whose work will be to prepare some book of common prayer or some liturgical service by which it is claimed our order of worship may be enriched. It is perhaps the most hazardous step our body has ever taken. Of course, it will be a work of several years, even for the most tentative form. If such a service ever appears, it will probably be many years more before any considerable body of our older churches, which have the traditions of Puritanism still strong within their walls, will adopt it; and it would be a matter of centuries before any such service could have those real merits by which a liturgy commends itself to a worshipping congregation. True, this latter objection is nothing against the attempt; for time would correct, and this would apply to the introduction of every new thought or enterprise by which humanity has been helped. But it would be interesting to reach down, if it were possible, to the underlying reasons which have prompted the attempt, and to forecast the results. No one need suppose that here is any panacea for lifeless churches, or any seed by which waste places of materialism can spring into spiritual freshness, or by which pulpit services can be made easy and interesting. If there is one fact more apparent than any other in ecclesiastical history, it is that liturgies have marked the decay of spiritual life. Think not that we would underrate the beauty and the use of those rich words of devotion which have fallen from lips consecrated to and gifted in prayer,— words which have been wrung from them in moments of soul-wrestling and soul-uplifting, and which must always be helpful to other souls; but, when they are put into forms only too familiar by regularly appointed use, their worth is apt to be diminished and lost. There may be some help in a liturgy. It can hardly be that a desire appearing in so many quarters is entirely without a meaning. Surely, with us, it must be brief, and free from the theological objections which put the historical liturgies beyond our use. We must bear in mind that some of the largest and most flourishing denominations feel no such need. And we must know that there is but one remedy for spiritual lifelessness in our churches, and that is spiritual life. Nothing will ever enrich worship but a devout spirit. If this is in the pews or in the pulpit, the forms of worship will take care of themselves. We will not protest against making the attempt. We only plead for a deeper individual consecration to the secret of devotional life.

In conclusion, the Council would simply and positively reaffirm our loyalty to our historic position and principle, clearly and sufficiently set forth in the Constitution of this Conference, by which for over twenty years we have carried on our work, we trust not without good results; and on that same basis we go forth to new endeavors.

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

BY REV. GRINDALL REYNOLDS, SECRETARY.

IT does not seem desirable, even if the time would permit, to make a detailed statement of the work of the Association. When we say that the contributions of the parishes for the last two years have been considerably in excess of those for the preceding period, that the demand for our literature has been unprecedented in amount, and that our success in all branches of our missionary work has been fully equal to that of former years, we can safely refer an inquirer for further particulars to the reports which every year have been put in print, and, if pastors and parish committees have been faithful, placed in the pews of every one of our churches.

But it *does* seem desirable to dwell at some length on certain branches of denominational work with which the Association is more or less directly connected, and which are likely to enter into the discussions of the Conference.

It is now several years since the Association put into the field State missionaries. At its last session, this Conference recommended a wide extension of the system. This has been honestly attempted, and at this moment some eight or nine missionaries are at work. And, as an ideal, the system is an excellent one. But, in this imperfect world, all ideals, however good, are apt to meet real, if not insurmountable, obstacles. The original plan was that the States in which missionaries were employed should pay one-half of the expenses, and the Association the other half. But, in some parts of the country, our churches are so few in number, so limited in resources, and so scattered in position that it is simply impossible for them to raise their allotted portion. On the other hand, the Association has committed to it so moderate a sum with which to do a wide and varied work that it is out of the question for it to attempt to bear the whole burden. This is not merely a supposable, but an actual difficulty. One of the States, and the one in which the system has worked, perhaps, to greatest advantage, has for the present, and possibly for a long time, suspended work, simply because its churches cannot raise their half of the dues. And other States are bridging over the difficulty by processes which greatly restrict, if they do not practically end, what is missionary in the work.

Nor is lack of means the only obstacle. Lack of men is quite as great a one. A good missionary must be a good preacher, and every inch a man; in short, one who can secure attention and command respect. Let us frankly own that we have not fifteen or twenty such strong, wise, and earnest men to spare from our pulpits. Why, the conference of the great State of New York has for well-nigh a year been looking for a fully equipped workman, and has not found him yet. In practice, then, some modification is unavoidable. Latterly, in its appointments for New England, for some of the States and Territories of the North-west, and for the Pacific slope, the Association has adopted the district system; that is, it has put

Hosted by Google

three States under the charge of one man. Whether this district system can be, or ought to be, in all cases applied, and whether, in principle, it is as good as that which it has in part supplanted, may be uncertain. Nay, it may be freely admitted that, with ample resources of money and men, it is not so good. It may be freely admitted, too, that it is now only provisional, and that it should be laid aside whenever the States can do their part to maintain their own workman. But that, with our present means and men, we must largely accept and use *it* or some other modification of the State missionary system, is clearly true; and we ought honestly to face the fact.

Two years ago, action was taken in this place which has resulted in the creation of what is known as the Church Building Loan Fund. I am well aware that the Directors have put this denominational interest in the charge of a special board of trustees, who will at a later hour report through their secretary. But the Association has furnished more than one-half of the principal of this fund, and the steady and healthy action of it is such a necessary prerequisite to complete missionary efficiency that it seems fit and proper for me to add a few words. We are to appoint all over this country State or district missionaries, as may seem best. That is distinctly understood and expected. Now, if these men really accomplish anything, they will sooner or later gather new societies. That is what we wish. We desire something permanent. Men die, but churches live. So we want living churches, which shall concretely represent the form of religion and Christianity for which we stand. But what does experience say? This,— that, during the period of early formation, a society can safely enough worship in a hall which is given up to other uses. But the time comes when it feels the need of a church building, around which sacred associations shall be woven, which shall furnish a place not only for worship, but for the social life, the educational work, and the benevolent activity proper to a church. When this time comes, and come it will, a society must build or die. But the law of a new society is poverty. It is not the old, the settled, who constitute it, but the young, the hopeful, who have life and the world before them. Hence, the constant and imperative necessity of some fund which shall afford financial help; that is, if we propose to plant churches. At this moment there are ten societies which ought to be housed before our next session. How can this be done? To a working body like the Association, this is a vital question. The fund has been a success. The difficulties of administration have not proved to be great, and the permanent existence of a large number of societies has been assured. But the amount usable as a loan fund has never exceeded $35,000, and the whole of that sum has been applied to its legitimate purpose of aiding church building. The need of an immediate and liberal increase of the principal of the fund is obvious. Each new society which is gathered but emphasizes afresh that necessity.

We desire to call attention to a new branch of denominational work, Southern and Indian Education. This, like the Loan Fund, is not directly in our charge, the board having appointed a committee in whose hands they have put the whole management of the work, and the duty of making special collections to support that work. This enterprise is directly in the line of our traditions. We have always maintained that we are to strive not so much to save human beings from future pain and loss as to make them, now and here, fit to do life's duties well. Yet it has happened, especially in respect to Indian education, that, from causes largely beyond our control, we have done little or nothing; while other religious

Hosted by Google

bodies, planning wisely and giving liberally, have established schools which are replacing savagery by civilization. All honor to them! For not only humanity and religion, but true patriotism, demand that we should do our part to dispel the darkness and banish the barbarism which are the twin foes of the nation's best life. The time is propitious for us to enter in and do the Lord's work. It is much that we can find a half-dozen intelligent and earnest men and women who are willing to give time, thought, and means to promote this object. It is much that fortune gives us the services of a man like Gen. Marshall, whose training at Hampton has made him master of the subject of Southern and Indian Education. It is much that we have competent persons, like Mr. and Mrs. Bond, who are ready to devote themselves to helping the helpless. It is much that we have a tribe of Indians who wish to throw off barbarism, who are conscious that the only hope of their children is education, intellectual and industrial. Everything, therefore, is ready to our hands except means. We need $3,000 to build and furnish the simple log buildings, in which shall be the homes of the teachers, the dormitories of the pupils, and the school-rooms for instruction. We need $3,000 more to support the teachers and assistants who shall instil into darkened minds not only what we call the elements of knowledge, but also give some acquaintance with the practical arts and trades. $6,000 in all! We cannot believe that the children of those who for half a century have been foremost in all benevolent works will hesitate long to furnish this sum.

One thing more the exigencies of the time sadly force upon our attention,— our sister church at Charleston. This is the oldest of our Southern churches. It has had a good history under honored men. In common with other organizations in that section, it has suffered much and been weakened much. But, with an honorable pride, it has steadily supported public worship, refusing help when many another society would have importunately demanded it. Eighteen months ago, I spent a few days at Charleston,— days ever to be remembered! The old church was beautiful even in its dilapidation, while the devotion of the people made an ineffaceable impression. About Easter time there came a great season of rejoicing. By the kindness of friends, the old temple had been restored. The pinnacles had been put back on the tower. The groined arches had been cleansed. Comely windows had replaced the old ones with their broken lights. And now a fresh calamity has come. The tower has fallen, the roof has been broken in, the beautiful ceiling is in ruins, and the house is untenantable. We sometimes ask, "What practical thing shall the Conference do at each of its sessions?" To-day, the answer comes, "*Rebuild the church at Charleston.*" The people cannot, for the calamity which has destroyed their church has impoverished them. We *must* do it. Or, rather, it is our *privilege* to do it. I am instructed by the Directors of the Association to present some resolutions looking to the performance of this duty, which I shall ask permission to do at the close of this report.

The accomplishment of these things presupposes on the part of our people liberal giving. Nothing is accomplished in the material world except at a price. Certainly, in the spiritual kingdom, nothing is won except at the cost of faith, devotion, and unstinted generosity. If the general work of the Association is to continue and increase, we must give $60,000 a year. If the Church Building Loan Fund is to meet a constantly recurring need, each year should bring enlargement to its principal. If we are to take our place in the brotherhood of those religious bodies that are working for that higher Christian civilization which

Hosted by Google

includes all races, all colors, all conditions, and blesses and uplifts all, we shall need $6,000 more. While, to do the brotherly act, which every heart says must be done, and restore Charleston church, $10,000 will be required. Perhaps in all a hundred thousand dollars. A large sum! Yes. But we ourselves have repeatedly exceeded it. And, when we hear that *one* church of another denomination has given far more than that in a single year, it seems clear that, if *our* three hundred and fifty churches have any real faith in the pure Christianity for which they stand or any genuine purpose to build up God's kingdom of righteousness on the earth, then good work will not stop for lack of means or men.

We cannot close this report without speaking of two losses. A few months ago, amid universal regret, the President of our Association for a dozen years, Henry P. Kidder, died. He was a liberal giver always, and a cheerful one. To him we owe the movement which gave us our admirable head-quarters. From him every charity in his native city, whether it ministered to body, mind, or soul, received generous support. He was more a liberal giver of *himself*, bestowing time and strength without stint. We sometimes say that there is no such thing as a necessary man. What we should say is that, even when its bravest and best fall, the army of the Lord has to close up its ranks and go forward. So we have closed up our ranks. But it will be hard to find one like unto him, of lofty integrity, of soundest judgment, of ample fortune, with liberal hand, with consecrated heart.

Two months ago, the telegram came to our office that Rev. Mr. Dall was dead. For thirty-one years he was a missionary in a foreign land and to an alien race, laboring with a zeal and fidelity which age could not cool nor physical weakness subdue. Such a career should not close without notice. Naturally, we sometimes ask, Has such distant work any real use? But when we find in all the Calcutta papers a tender and regretful notice of this lonely Unitarian missionary who worshipped God after the manner they called heresy; when we read that never, with one possible exception, did such a large number of Hindus follow an Englishman to his grave, literally covering his coffin with garlands and flowers,—we come to understand that this man, whether he could or could not count his converts by hundreds or thousands, had not lived and died in vain, when he left upon so many hearts the impress of his gentle Christian spirit and his heroic Christian faithfulness.

So the roll of our saints is growing long. To what purpose, unless, as they pass to the immortality of higher progress beyond, we give to them here the immortality of noble and permanent influence; unless we take up the work they lay down? Men and brethren, What say you? Will you not keep the fires burning on all the ancient altars? Will you not rear new altars wherever devout souls, hungering for a freer and richer gospel, are?

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE WESTERN CONFERENCE.

BY REV. JOHN R. EFFINGER, SECRETARY.

In complying with the summons of your Secretary to present at this meeting a report of the work of the Western Unitarian Conference, I labor under the disadvantage of having been but a few months the incumbent of the office of Western Secretary, and cannot therefore speak with that personal knowledge of its general work for the last two years which gives special life and interest to a report of this kind. Still, I assure you there was never so much to report as now; and the failure, if any, will be in the reporter, not in the fulness of things to be reported.

Whoever speaks for the Western Conference to-day no longer represents a body maintaining merely the simplest form of organic life, but for a quite complex organism. Following the law of evolution, it has, within the last few years, put forth a head(-quarter), in which a deal of thinking is done, at 175 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

It has developed two good arms, labelled Women's Western Unitarian Conference and Western Unitarian Sunday School Society. It has found a strong prophetic voice in the Western Publishing Committee, which is making itself heard far and wide, sending forth its clear, earnest presentations of Unitarian beliefs, inciting to reverent thought and worship and the religious education of the young.

It has also become the parent of several vigorous offspring in the shape of State Conferences, christened respectively Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Kansas, Nebraska, etc.; and these are putting forth tentacles of their own, and becoming the centres of new life and activity.

The head-quarters is a busy centre of our denominational life in the West. It contains the desk of the Secretaries of the Western Conference, the Women's Conference, the Sunday School Society, and the editor of *Unity*. It is also the Channing Club Room. It is the rendezvous of Unitarian ministers and laymen both in and out of Chicago, and a sort of general intelligence office for the denomination at large.

It is the depository of our publications, including a full line of American Unitarian Association tracts and a good assortment of American Unitarian Association books. When a brother from Massachusetts concludes to go West and grow up with the country, it is to this office he writes for information and direction. If a preacher is wanted at Thompson's Station to break the Unitarian bread of life to hungry souls, o ra church is to be organized or a minister ordained in Colorado, or a brother in Wisconsin or Michigan wants his pulpit supplied for a Sunday, it is to this office that application is made. If material is wanted for the Sunday-school at Santa Barbara or Bloomington, or if the army of Post-office Mission workers throughout the West want material for distribution, it is here they turn for supplies. It is to this centre that the Sunday-school teachers of our Chicago churches come every Monday noon to consider the lesson for the next

Hosted by Google

Sunday, under the leadership of one of the ministers of the city. This is the meeting place of the boards of directors of our different branches of Western work. It is the place of hospitality, the promoter of fellowship, the indispensable condition of organic life and growth to our cause in the West.

The Women's Western Conference have been doing most effective service. It is promoting among our women an intelligent interest in Unitarian ideas and work. It is producing a body of earnest, consecrated women, full of zeal and enthusiasm for our cause, abounding in good works and in missionary labors.

The Chicago Women's Unitarian Association, auxiliary to the Conference, with its one hundred and ninety-four members, deserves especial mention as an effective agency in uniting and inspiring the Unitarian women of Chicago. It is one aim of the Women's Conference to multiply such societies throughout the West. But the work by which the Women's Conference is best known, and through which it is accomplishing the most immediate results, is the Post-office Mission, by means of which a large amount of lay talent is brought into service, and thousands of copies of Unitarian publications are distributed to eager readers from Vermont to California, from Michigan to Florida. This work is done with so much method and with such personal sympathy and interest that it is likely to produce large results, with small waste of money and material.

North and South, East and West, on the most distant outposts of civilization, men and women and children through this agency are brought into personal communication with earnest minds and religious spirits in Illinois, Ohio, Iowa, or Missouri, and are enlightened and stimulated by the ministry of this mission. Thus, we have a complete network of magnetic lines of sympathy crossing and recrossing each other in all directions throughout the country. The report of the Secretary of the Women's Conference shows that in the last two years 63,567 papers and tracts have been distributed to 2,564 people. We cannot fail to see how increasingly important a branch of Unitarian work this must prove itself. It is the sowing of seed which must yield, some thirty, some sixty, some a hundred fold.

In this connection, I cannot forbear to mention the lamented death of Miss Ellis, of Cincinnati, out of whose earnest and loving spirit the Post-office Mission blossomed as a fragrant flower of sympathy and help. Long will she live

> "In minds made better by her presence,
> In pulses stirred to generosity,
> In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
> For miserable aims that end with self."

Long will she

> "Be to other souls
> The cup of strength in some great agony,
> . . . the sweet presence of a good diffused."

Sustained as she was by the women of Cincinnati, she illustrated the large possibilities of Post-office Mission work which other secretaries are already in some degree beginning to realize.

Tne Sunday School Society is gradually bringing about a revolution in our Sunday-schools. It is introducing method and seriousness into our Sunday-school work, giving us a good variety of carefully prepared lessons, a higher order of music, and liturgical services which cultivate the spirit of worship and the habit of devout expression in the young. The importance of this work cannot be overestimated. We are doing nothing in the West more carefully, and nothing of greater value to the Unitarian cause. This work is in the hands of a picked com-

Hosted by Google

pany, elected to their places from year to year because they belong there, and working together with a noble unselfishness not often matched. What this society has done, what it hopes to do, and what spirit animates it, you will gather from the report of its Secretary, Mrs. E. T. Leonard, this afternoon.

The Publishing Committee has, within the last two years, published 54,437 tracts and new editions of previous publications amounting to 13,000, making a total of 67,437. The publication of *Unity* Short Tracts was begun in May, 1885, since when fifteen have been issued; and, out of the 36,614 published, 28,708 have been sold and distributed.

Of tract No. 13,— "Blessed be Drudgery," — over 13,000 copies have been sold.

Of Unity Mission Tracts, including new editions, 30,323 have appeared within the last two years.

No. 28, just out, entitled "Love to God and Love to Man," is a collection of forty-seven songs for revival tunes, to be sold at five cents a copy. It is a rather daring attempt to wed our rational religious feeling and thought to music which has heretofore been the accompaniment of a more sensational and dramatic form of religion than ours can claim to be.

Let me call special attention to Nos. 18, 19, 21, which consist of brief biographical sketches of and selections from the works of our three great masters, — Channing, Parker, and Martineau. Each tract is a little book in itself, containing an index of contents and a collection of the best thoughts on many subjects of these three great prophets of our faith. Besides these, two series of *Church-door Pulpit* sermons, twenty each, have been published. These have been especially interesting as bringing us contributions from gifted minds of various and widely separated religious connections. Discontinued as a separate publication, the *Church-door Pulpit* is still preaching through the *Unity* supplement, which is designed to appear semi-monthly.

The State Conferences are slowly developing strength and resources. Four out of seven within our Western Conference bounds, through the assistance of our ever generous mother,— the American Unitarian Association,— are employing State Secretaries, who are actively pushing missionary work. We are learning to value these conferences as most important agencies in the advancement of our general work.

To cultivate our territory by State lines is, we believe, to develop a State consciousness and enthusiasm, from which we may hope for large results. Given a State conference alive and active, and you may count on growth in the number and prosperity of your churches from year to year. Of these conferences, I should speak more particularly but for the special report on the subject to be presented by Mr. Forbush.

A few years ago, Western Unitarianism was without a single journal devoted to its interests. Now, we have a weekly, a semi-monthly, and a monthly. *Unity*, edited by J. Ll. Jones and others, has attained the dignity of Volume XVIII., No. 3. It is issued weekly. Its publishing interests are growing in importance, and its subscription list shows a gain of about twenty-five per cent. in the last sixteen months. *Our Best Words*, edited by Jasper L. Douthit, at Shelbyville, Ill., has become a fortnightly. It is published every other Saturday, at seventy-five cents a year. The *Unitarian*, which borrows one editor from Boston,— Brooke Herford,— the other being J. T. Sunderland, of Chicago, is published monthly, at fifty cents a year. The first number was issued in January last. It

Hosted by Google

is an attempt to furnish a paper of twenty-eight pages at a low price, to serve as a liberal missionary throughout the country; and the rapidity with which its first edition of ten thousand was exhausted would argue a strong demand for the paper.

The work of church building is going cheerily on in the West. In respect to this, I quote from the report of my predecessor, given at Cincinnati in May last: "The past year of the Conference has been pre-eminently a *building* year. One church — the beautiful stone structure at Madison, Wis. — has been finished and dedicated. The basement story of another — that of the Scandinavian Society in Minneapolis — has been completed within the year; and we have now in the West no less than eight other churches in process of erection,— namely, one at Topeka, Kan., one at Helena, Wis., one in Minneapolis, Minn. (that of Mr. Simmons's Society, making with Mr. Janson's two in that city), All Souls' Church, Chicago, a church at Midland, Mich., one at Manistee, Mich., one at Grand Rapids, Mich., and one in St. Joseph, Mo.,— in all, ten churches built or building during the year. And then, besides these, steps are being taken toward building in four other places; namely, Kansas City, Mo., Beatrice, Neb., Denver and Greeley, Col. So that there is building activity this year in no less than fourteen Western places." Mr. Sunderland's report continues: "If the past has been eminent as a building year, it has also been a year of excellent prosperity in the way of church organization. . . . We have for the year no less than ten new movements, seven of them already organized churches." This does not include one at Warren, Ill., which has taken shape since the date of this report. "This is certainly," continues the report, "most encouraging. It has all been quiet work. It has attracted little attention; but it seems to be work which, for the most part, will be likely to endure." (See page 193 of the Conference number of *Unity*, June 5, 1886.)

Since this report was given, several of the churches mentioned therein as in process of building have been completed. I would call especial attention to four of these churches, because of the light they throw on the problem of church building. All Souls' Church, Chicago, combining parsonage and church, of attractive and unique architecture, was built at a cost of $10,000, contributed by hundreds of friends East and West. It is the result of Brother Jones's arduous toil and the fruition of his hopes. Another enterprise of the same indefatigable worker has been the building of the Helena church, Wisconsin, which is a wonder of completeness and beauty, for the sum of $1,600. The church of Topeka, Kan., of tasteful design and admirable arrangement, cost but $3,500; and the Midland church, Michigan, complete in all its appointments, was built for $2,400. This new departure in church building ought to commend itself to the good sense and moral sense of our people. To put less money into towers and spires, to build within our means, and such churches as accommodate our actual needs, is surely the part of wisdom and honesty. We owe a debt of gratitude to those who are showing us how this thing can be done. To the Church Building Loan Fund and to the American Unitarian Association, we are debtors continually for the timely lift, the generous assistance, without which our church building schemes could not have been consummated.

For twenty years, I have been associated with the Western Conference. My lot has been cast in three different States. I have travelled over eighteen thousand miles in Illinois in the last three years in pursuance of my work as Secretary of the State Conference, and have conversed with many people; and I am

Hosted by Google

persuaded that Unitarianism, on the whole, in the field that has come under my observation, was never so constructive, never so thoughtful, never so sincerely religious as now.

The ministers were never more appreciative of the treasures of religious faith and knowledge which have come down to us from the past, never so sure that religion is fundamental in the human soul, that it will remain unshaken before every assault.

We have appreciated to the full the advantage of our position, as stated recently by one of the fathers of our faith in Boston. "One of our main advantages as heretics," says Mr. Clarke, "is freedom from the care of our reputation. The theologians have already prejudiced the public against us as much as possible; and, no matter what we say, they cannot make the matter worse. Thus, we are saved from the necessity of watching our own shadow, and can go boldly forward following the truth."

If this represents the Eastern situation,— and I have not the slightest doubt that it does,— then my predecessor, Mr. Sunderland, spoke truly two years ago, when he said in his report to this Conference, "Let me assure the friends of the East that the West and the East were never so near together in sympathy as they are now." I am glad to add my testimony that the situation is unchanged at this date.

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE STATE AND LOCAL CONFERENCES.

BY REV. T. B. FORBUSH, OF MILWAUKEE.

THE Council has requested me to present the biennial report of the activities of the local and State conferences. There are twenty-three of these conferences. Twenty-one of them have been received and collated. Ten are specifically local, situated in and about Massachusetts. Eleven are State organizations, reaching from Maine to Nebraska. Two, the "Southern" and the "Pacific Coast," embrace large territorial districts. Outside these, there are not a few parishes *in partibus infidelibus*, like Canada, Colorado, Pennsylvania, or Vermont, which have not yet developed the conference consciousness.

It is obvious that the conditions of the local and the State conferences are quite dissimilar. They have not the same origin or the same purpose. The local conferences trace their ancestry to those old ministerial associations which were the best theological schools thirty years ago, and in which every young preacher took his post-graduate course. They formed upon the lines of those associations, and extended to the churches that spiritual culture and impetus which the association gave the ministers. Their aim is spiritual culture rather than religious propagandism. Though they are prompt to aid feeble churches within their limits, and to reach the helping hand to any knot of people desirous of becoming a church, they are not specially organized for missionary work. They look to the American Unitarian Association as their missionary, and the churches composing them contribute a large portion of the funds which support its wise and far-reaching operations.

Hence, they report little direct missionary activity. They have raised about $2,000 during the last two years for local work, mostly in the Channing and Suffolk Conferences. As only $577 is reported to have been disbursed, the money would seem to have exceeded the opportunity. Missionary work by settled pastors is reported in three or four local conferences, which is valuable preparation for future churches, though immediate results are small. These ten conferences report only two new churches established within their boundaries since September, 1884, one old church revived, and two experimental preaching places opened, which may result in churches. Their secretaries do not know any other localities in which there is prospect of successful missionary work. One secretary writes, "Every town in our conference has a Unitarian church." Another: "Our towns are small, and rapidly decreasing in population. There are enough liberal people, but it would be folly to attempt to plant churches." Still another: "We should have no thought of new parishes. Our specially needed miracle is to bring the dead ones to life."

Somewhat in contrast with these despondent sentences, and illustrative of the saying that the eye sees what it looks for, comes the statement of Dr. Moors, the very efficient missionary for Southern New England. He also notes the decadence of some of the country towns, but finds much encouragement among the more prosperous ones. He reports seven new churches in Massachusetts since

Hosted by Google

September, 1884, all in a thriving condition. Six of them have stated ministers; one has built and occupies its church; another will soon dedicate; two are raising funds for building; three still worship in halls. Dr. Moors not only shows this good record of work accomplished, but he also disagrees with the conference secretaries in regard to the opportunity. He finds fresh fields continually opening. He writes: "In the larger towns, of which there are many where there is no liberal church, our word is welcomed; and a congregation can be readily gathered which will contain a nucleus of earnest devoted people, who will be glad to sustain public worship on a liberal basis. From this class, much may be hoped in the near future." Such a report of ripened and ripening harvest from the overseer of the vineyard is encouraging.

Though the local conferences may not be fully alive to their home missionary opportunity, by their frequent meetings, at which many people from all the parishes gather, they are doing a noble work of religious quickening and spiritual culture; and they thereby create and deepen an interest in our liberal faith, which finds expression in the Denominational Home, the Loan Fund, and in generous aid extended through the American Unitarian Association to benefit recent enterprises all over the land. They keep the fire burning brightly on the old altars, for which even we who have wandered so far away have a very tender reverence. "The glory of their work cannot be blotted out."

To this increase of activity, this development of earnest purpose, this broadening intellectual hospitality, this growing spiritual unity, the local conferences have largely contributed, and thus justify themselves as a most important factor in the progress of Unitarianism.

The State conferences have a different origin and work. They have no ancestry. They were created by an exigency,—created, some of them, pretty nearly out of nothing. But the power that created them breathed life into them, and enabled them to become life-giving. When the tide of organic life which gave birth to this National Conference began to rise, it touched all our churches. Even the most scattered felt the thrill. The instinct of co-operation was aroused, while large possibilities of work became visible. Inspired by the new spirit, conferences were formed to consider and meet the new conditions. After some years of fluctuation, these conferences arranged themselves on State lines and became missionary organizations. There was no need of seeking something to do. "The Greeks were at their doors." The opportunity was greater than the ability to enter upon it, even when local weakness was backed by denominational strength. It still surpasses our endeavor, and grows with every year. This is true of State conference work both East and West. Maine and New Hampshire are among the foremost in opportunity and in good work well done.

Omitting New York, which has not yet organized for active work, Ohio, which for some years has been in a comatose condition, and the Southern, which has not reported since September, 1884, there have been within the boundaries of the remaining conferences seventeen new churches established, twelve old ones revived, and fairly successful experimental preaching at some forty points,—not a bad showing, considering the intermittent character of the effort. Maine, Illinois, and Kansas are the only States which have had an active missionary for the full period; and the time of the Kansas missionary has been mostly devoted to one city. Michigan has had twelve months' paid work, largely given to nursing sick churches. Indiana has had a half-time man for two years; Iowa, a minister at large for a portion of the time. In Wisconsin and New Hampshire,

Hosted by Google

the work has been in the hands of local pastors, save what the recently appointed missionary for Northern New England may have accomplished in New Hampshire. About $6,000 have been raised by the churches of the State conferences for this missionary work, besides their contributions to the American Unitarian Association, the Loan Fund, and the Western Conference. They have also contributed somewhat toward church building in new places. The amount raised for both purposes is, in round numbers, $12,000, *nearly one-half of which is to be credited to New Hampshire.* The American Unitarian Association has grandly supplemented this work. West of the Hudson, it has spent $5,000 in State missionary work, $8,000 for services on the Pacific Coast, and some $28,000 in college towns, aid to individual churches, individual ministers, etc.

Along with this paid work has gone much unpaid but exceedingly valuable labor of local pastors, who have given thought and time to its wise direction, have rendered not a little personal service, and been instrumental in founding some of the most prosperous of the new churches.

With this statement of work done, this report should properly close. But consideration of the work done brings us face to face with present conditions, and these conditions suggest future possibilities. Hence, you must pardon the departure from the function of a reporter, which follows.

The present situation has its strength and its weakness. There are three sources of strength. First, the steadily developing organic life, the increasing organic sense, and improving organic method of the working conferences. They are gaining solidity and self-respect, begin to feel that they are somewhat, that they have come to stay, that they have a great opportunity and a solemn duty. Second, the growing habit of missionary work, which gives increasing efficiency, stimulates interest, and stirs the churches to "lend a hand," and the heartiness of American Unitarian Association co-operation with all local endeavor. Third, the deepening religious consciousness of our churches. They are beginning to know what manner of spirit they are of, to comprehend the mightiness of the truths which they represent, to feel that they do not stand for a modified past, but for a transcendent future. This conviction gives steadiness, seriousness, and consecration. The days of negation and controversy are gone: the days of affirmation and prophecy are at hand. Growing organic life, greater familiarity with, and more perfect co-operation in, missionary work, a deepening sense of eternal truth and of its importance to the world,— these are our sources of strength. We are seeing our work more clearly, are learning how to do it; and the hearts of our workers are full of hope and enthusiasm.

Our sources of weakness are also three. First, the non-workers. It is a weakness for the strong State of New York to be without an active missionary, a weakness for Ohio to lie in its moribund condition, a weakness for Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Vermont to have no organic life and State action, a weakness that such a broad belt of passivity stretches across the very centre of the land. Second, the intermittent character of much of our work. This arises partly from its newness. We are not trained to steady pulling, have not acquired the virtue of persistence. A State which needs mission work this year needs it next year, and it is a grave error to suspend it. Everything goes backward, and gathering the fragments is often impossible. More than one State has suffered irreparably from this intermittent work. This suggests the third weakness,— lack of general plan and method. This whole missionary business should be systematized. All possible ground should be covered, and each church should be inter-

Hosted by Google

ested in and made to feel responsible for its own State work. Hitherto, State conference activities have usually hinged on the zeal of one or two ministers. If they personally attended to the missionary work, it would prosper. If they went away or ceased to give it attention, it would stop. But this work has grown too important to go any longer in this haphazard fashion. Wise plans are needed, embracing the whole field, which shall be steadily followed year after year. Then there will be noble and far-reaching results. Nor will the money be lacking. People will gladly give when they see that we understand our work and mean to do it well.

How can we so use our strength as to overcome our weaknesses? First, foster and increase organic life. Every State where there are even two or three churches should have a conference, while single churches should affiliate with their nearest neighbors. The effort to give the life in us expression conduces to its growth, consulting together awakens interest, opens opportunity, creates desire to do something. And, where two or three gather for the good work, power will be in the midst of them. Every conference should avoid figure-head officers, chosen for the influence of their names, and should place its interests in charge of its most earnest, devoted men. It should be the special business of such officers to plan and push the missionary work. This matter of organic life and action is of such importance that it is a question whether all missionary activity should not hinge on it, whether the American Unitarian Association might not wisely decline to prosecute missionary operations in States where the local churches have not faith enough in themselves and their cause to take organic steps for its furtherance.

Second, if organic life is to be preserved and increased, it must go to work. Missionary work is what State conferences are for. It is their reason for existence. Without it, they have only the name to live. Sometimes, this work can be done by local pastors. Sometimes, it needs the special missionary. The missionary board must exercise its wisdom. But the work must be done steadily and efficiently. Twenty years' experience has led me to certain conclusions. Do not broadcast the seed. It is sad waste. We have not men enough to "sow beside all waters." It may sometimes be necessary to skirmish through a dozen towns to select available points. But continued skirmishing is time and money thrown away. Concentrated effort wins. Let the missionary committee select the point of attack. Let the nearest pastors, the men with local reputation, prepare the way, the special missionary meanwhile supplying their pulpits. When the ground is ready, let the missionary work it thoroughly to assured success or failure. It is often wise for the missionary to remain as pastor of the church which he builds up, and to call in a fresh man for the next venture. This missionary business is demoralizing, especially to young men. It is a good thing to get out of early. Unless the missionary is peculiarly wise and level-headed, it is better to have a succession of men under direction of local pastors and the conference committee. The work will be more effective, there will be no break in the life of the growing churches, man after man will be helped into a congenial field, and the expense will, on the whole, be less.

Third, the work, to reach highest efficiency, must be co-operative. With active State conferences working in harmony with the American Unitarian Association, need will be felt — it is already felt in the West — of consultation among these missionary committees about wants, methods, and prospects of sympathy and co-operation. Hence, some general missionary board (I speak especially

Hosted by Google

now of the West), composed of the State conference officers, is desirable, which shall meet from time to time to compare notes, discuss plans, consider places and men, and devise the largest and wisest evangelization scheme for the territory which they represent. Such a board would give unity and efficiency to the whole work, would distribute exertion wisely, encourage and stimulate the lagging, and give solidity and permanence to what is now fragmentary and intermittent. The recommendations of such a body of experienced men, with full knowledge and careful consideration of the entire situation, would have weight with the whole denomination. When we have enlisted our best heart and brain in active missionary work, our weakness will disappear and our strength increase.

Does the opportunity justify any such large endeavor? Only those lacking in experience can doubt it. If, as Dr. Moors writes, the larger towns of Southern New England are ready for the liberal faith, the larger towns of the West are more ready. Mr. Jennings, in his enthusiasm, declares that a Unitarian church could be established straightway in every city in Indiana, were there men enough. Seven other State secretaries report by name some forty places in which there is fair prospect of churches being gathered during the next two years by earnest work. It has often been said that there is not a town of twenty thousand inhabitants in the country where a liberal church cannot be planted. Perhaps this is true. But it is also true that the villages and the country side are ready for our word. There are whole sections in the West where Orthodoxy has lost its grip. The churches are falling into neglect. Some are standing vacant: others are supported under protest by those who do not attend their worship or believe their dogmas. The people hunger for liberal thought and a liberal faith. These dead churches are waiting resurrection. This statement is neither guess-work nor hearsay. I have seen these dry bones live, these dilapidated buildings grow trim and neat, these empty walls fill with eager listeners from village shops and far outlying farms, have seen the whole atmosphere of a town change at the advent of the Unitarian gospel. Two of these resurrected churches have joined the Wisconsin Conference within two years. There are several more in which a like movement is in progress. This, which has happened in a single locality where a live man has found his place and work, will repeat itself in many other localities, when men appear who have in them the making of successful country ministers. There are thoughtful men and women in the country as well as in the city. They equally welcome rational religion, and they are not so hindered by social and other obstacles from following out their convictions.

There is a call everywhere for a readjustment of religious teaching upon the basis of modern knowledge. It is our high privilege and solemn duty to respond to that call, and to perform our providential part in shaping the grander faith of the future.

I cannot better close this report than with the stirring words of Dr. Moors: —

"The signs of a mighty uprising of new ideas and of emancipation from old-time theories are clear and abundant. The world is alive with new thought. It is getting out of the ruts, and is going forward, not backward. Of this new, hopeful movement, we of the liberal church — the church of the onward and upward look — are the heralds and prophets. Let us not fear the future."

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE CHURCH BUILDING LOAN FUND.

BY REV. HOWARD N. BROWN, SECRETARY.

THE first meeting of the trustees of the Church Building Loan Fund, at which officers were elected and rules were adopted for its management, was held Jan. 13, 1885. The Fund has therefore been in existence something more than a year and a half, and its officers have reason to hope that an account of the work accomplished during this time will prove satisfactory to those who have contributed to its establishment.

The need of such an institution has been long felt by many among us; and, when the trustees came together, they were at no loss to conceive very definitely the work they were set to do.

The most critical period in the life of a new church is that during which it undertakes to provide its first house of worship. Many young organizations which have found it impossible to live might have been saved from their hard fate by a very moderate amount of timely help extended at just this point; and it may be predicted that attempts to found churches will be greatly multiplied, when the missionary spirit is sure of aid to meet this often fatal strain. But, in trying to administer such aid, it is necessary to beware of two dangers: first, that of lending a little more feeble vitality to societies predestined for failure; and, second, that of weakening in strong new movements their habit of self-help and self-respect. The slender size of our missionary resources renders it inexpedient to rescue from dissolution such growths as must become permanent leeches upon our treasury, and warns us to leave them to the somewhat rude but, on the whole, beneficent action of the law of natural selection. Again, experience teaches that it is as easy to pauperize an organization as an individual by injudicious giving, and that, when a society has fallen into the constant practice of seeking external help, it is almost impossible to develop hardy strength in its paralytic nerves and sinews. Both these dangers are fairly met by making the aid supplied a loan, to be repaid in such fashion as not to overtax the powers of a young and growing church. The hopelessly weak and the naturally shiftless will not bind themselves by specific contract to return the money that they seek, and are left to eliminate themselves from the field of applicants. The healthy and vigorous new organizations are no worse, but all the better, for paying their debts in honest, manful fashion, and giving back for others' use the outside assistance that has enabled them to make a start in the world. By granting loans without interest, so that every dollar repaid counts toward extinguishment of the debt, and dividing the obligation into yearly instalments of moderate amount, the trustees of the Loan Fund believe that they can enable any zealous society to build and pay for a church home equal to its need. These are the general considerations that have shaped their policy. They have also felt that in special cases, having means in their possession not otherwise demanded, they might make loans to assist in

Hosted by Google

clearing off old church debts. But a case of this kind has to be very special to claim their attention; nor will they invest a single dollar in a church already provided with a comfortable house, while that dollar is asked for by a hopeful new society, struggling to escape from the gloom of a hired hall to the light and cheer of a home that it can call its own. The young dog, hints the proverb, is the one that should be expected to acquire new tricks. The trick of good business management may now and then be learned through hard experience by a church which has grown to mature life without knowledge of that important art. But, generally, the brain of such a one is too impervious to permit reform; and it is wiser to trust to the growth of administrative ability in the young church, whose carelessness has not yet settled into chronic inefficiency.

A very brief recital of facts will show the amount and character of the work so far accomplished. On the first of May last, the Fund had received from the churches contributions amounting in all to $18,805.95. To this add $25,000, contributed by the American Unitarian Association, and $120 of interest, and subtract $56.45, which is the expense account with which the Fund stands charged, we have $43,869.50 as the amount placed at the disposal of the trustees from which loans have been made. Fourteen loans have been voted, and mostly paid over. If we reckon also, as we may, an application now pending, which undoubtedly will be voted and paid within a few days, then we count fifteen loans, whose sum total is $42,200. Since the statement of our treasurer, between four and five hundred dollars have been received in gifts from the churches, making their contributions, in all, about $19,200, and leaving us with a little more than $2,000 of the original Fund not yet taken. For most of this small remnant, the place is nearly prepared; and it is being held against an application which we expect to be made during the present season.

Practically, the Fund is all invested; and, unless additions are made to it, the trustees have no work before them, save to reinvest the payments on these loans as they come back to us.

The terms upon which they have been voted call for an annual return of $3,570, which is a trifle less than 8½ per cent. of the whole sum loaned. Leaving out of account, however, two loans amounting to $9,000, concerning which the trustees, being bound by the vote of the last Conference, were not free to make their own terms, the returns are a little more than 10½ per cent. of the whole sum loaned; and this represents more truly the conditions on which future investments will be made. Of these fifteen loans, twelve have gone into churches entirely new, and three have been granted to assist in lifting debts which threatened the existence of churches already established. Six of them have been placed in the East, and nine in the West. The national character of the Fund is sufficiently vindicated by calling the roll of States in which its loans are placed: Maine, 1; New Hampshire, 1; Massachusetts, 4; Wisconsin, 1; Michigan, 1; Iowa, 2; Minnesota, 1; Missouri, 1; Kansas, 1; Nebraska, 1; Colorado, 1.

Few of these loans were completed in season to bring the first payment on them within the first year's work. But on the date of our annual meeting, in May, $825 had been returned to our treasury, which shows that the collection of the Fund for a second disbursement has already begun.

The trustees have encountered some scepticism concerning the repayment of this money, but do not themselves entertain the least apprehension. Every dollar is amply secured, and (save in one instance) we have in our hands the legal means for collecting every last cent of our loans. We are, in time of peace, so

Hosted by Google

well prepared for war that we do not anticipate any necessity to enforce our claims through the courts; though, if need should arise, the trustees would harden their hearts, and make a conspicuous example of the first society found in default. In addition to a mortgage on the church property, we propose to hold, in all cases, the note of the church, indorsed by individual men whose private means are adequate to the payment of the debt, should the society fail. In short, our loans are as perfect and complete business transactions as if they were negotiated by a savings bank; and we make no pretence of benevolence, save that our loans are without interest, and for such a term of years as to allow of easy repayment.

Perhaps it will not be deemed unpardonable to sound here a small trumpet by way of calling attention to the slight cost at which this work has been done. About one mill and a third has paid the way of every dollar we have handled. Or, more largely stated, we can boast that for each hundred dollars paid out of our Fund we have consumed less than fifteen cents as the cost of our administration. We may expect this cost, in the future as in the past, to be more than met by the interest on balances temporarily in our possession, so that we feel sure of guarding the Fund entirely from waste, and even of adding something to it each year by its own increase.

In commending this branch of our missionary organization to those who are interested in planting new Unitarian churches, we desire to emphasize the economy of its operation, and the fact that whatever is put into it remains a permanent source of help. Its capital is put forth only to be drawn back by steady degrees, that it may be again and again expended. Above all, the speed with which this Fund has been taken up by those for whom it was intended is, under the conditions upon which it has been expended, proof positive that its mission was needed; and, were there time to adduce evidence, I could show you that the need is as great at this present moment as it was a year and a half ago. We have now on file an application for aid which we cannot give before the middle of next summer, unless we receive fresh contributions. The State Missionary of Massachusetts wants to build next season four new churches, not one of which can be built without the help of the Loan Fund. In many other quarters, the preachers of our faith are gathering societies, which, by the assistance of this Fund, may be carried over from precarious infancy to vigorous and self-sustained maturity. I do not hesitate to affirm that for the next five years we can find employment for $15,000 annually, over and above the income of invested loans. I believe the day not far distant when a Fund of $200,000, yielding a return of $20,000 a year, will be found wholly inadequate to render needful aid to the new building waiting to be done. We do not ask to have a single penny diverted from the American Unitarian Association to our support. Indeed, we have no work to do, save where the Association has been before us with its agents and missionaries, planting the seed from which churches spring. But we do say to the denomination that if, in addition to a generous support of other forms of missionary enterprise, it will give us means to provide new societies with a material shelter and home, we will show those mourning friends, who have so long held themselves in readiness, upon an instant's notice, to attend the funeral of Unitarianism, that their much doctored patient retains no little power of healthy growth.

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY.

BY REV. HENRY G. SPAULDING, SECRETARY.

NEXT year, the Unitarian Sunday School Society, which has become an incorporated body since the last meeting of this Conference, will celebrate its *sixtieth* anniversary. From its day of small things, threescore years ago, to its present day of brighter hope and larger promise and better achievement, it has been the principal agent of the American Unitarian churches for promoting the cause of Sunday-schools. It has been from the beginning a co-operative society. The voluntary and unpaid services of many of our best men and women on its Board of Directors have guided its course and shaped its undertakings. Among its executive officers have been some of the most faithful and devoted of both our laity and our clergy.

The Society has done a good work, though much of its work has been without observation. Its seed-sowing has brought forth rich harvests in many a field where the reapers never knew who the sowers were. It has been a silent, persistent educational power, making always for Christian character. Like a mountain brook, its course has been often hidden or unnoticed; but it has supplied motive force to many agencies for carrying on the moral training and the religious education of our children, and it has kept in running order many a Sunday-school that has been at once the workshop and the training-school of the church to which it belonged.

The recent history of the Sunday School Society is a bright and interesting chapter in the annals of our body; for there has unquestionably been, during the past five years, a genuine revival of interest in Sunday-school work throughout the denomination. An advance all along the line is clearly to be seen. There are churches, not a few, wherein the best social, philanthropic, and religious life of the parish has centred in the Sunday-school; and, in such schools, the labors of the Sunday School Society have had a noticeable effect in raising the standard of instruction and improving the general quality of the work which they have engaged in. Other schools, less favorably situated, less cared for by pastor and congregation, having to work against the inertia of indifference or the opposition of doubt and criticism, have caught the fresh faith and zeal that have been in the air, and have entered on a new era of expectation and promise.

To our Unitarian churches and Sunday-schools, the Sunday School Society is known chiefly under the aspect of a book-publishing and book-selling house. Is a Sunday-school to be equipped for its year's work with a service-book and hymnal for its worship, with text-books for its teaching, and a Sunday-school paper to promote the general interests of the school? The Sunday School Society is looked to for the needed supplies. Let a stranger from one of our congregations,— and I suppose that more persons who are actually strangers to Sunday-school work can be found in our Unitarian congregations than in those

Hosted by Google

of any other Christian body,— let such a stranger visit some of our Sunday-schools. He will probably be invited at the opening of the session to join in a devotional service, which has become the habitual and uplifting exercise of worship with both teachers and scholars, because of the books and other helps provided by the Sunday School Society. Let him next go about the room, and notice what the various classes are studying. He will either find the majority of the scholars using the Sunday-school lessons which the Sunday School Society publishes from year to year, or, if different books are used by pupils of different ages, he will observe the Society's imprint upon all, or nearly all, of the various manuals. The rare scholarship of Profs. Toy, Everett, and Allen; the consecrated learning of such ministers as James Freeman Clarke, Edward Hale, Howard Brown, Mr. Winkley, Mr. Dall, and Mr. Young; the ethical insight and motherly wisdom of such women as Mrs. Wells and Mrs. Wilson,— all these the Sunday School Society has laid under contribution, in order that the children who are growing up in our household of faith may be taught the principles and the doctrines of the religion which we hold dear.

Or let our stranger from the congregation follow some of these scholars to their homes,— see them reading in their Sunday-school paper stories that interest and elevate the young mind, biographies that bring great lives to the comprehension of little folks, leaves from Nature's book that open the eyes of childhood to God's wonderful creation,— or note the interest that these children take in a well-chosen library book; and, in all this educational process, he may detect the unseen workings of an organized Society whose sole end and aim is to make the Sunday-school, through all its various agencies and instrumentalities, a real helper to childhood's faith and hope and love.

It is doubtful if the majority of our Sunday-schools would be in successful operation to-day, had it not been for the direct assistance and indirect stimulus which they have received from the Unitarian Sunday School Society. It is certain that, but for the Society's earnest and persistent efforts, no such text-books of religion and ethics as are now used in our schools would have been prepared and placed, as they now are, within the reach of even the feeblest and poorest of our parishes.

Can any thoughtful Unitarian question the great value of such work as this? Is there, indeed, any other work carried on by our denomination that is more directly in the line of our most cherished convictions as Unitarian Christians? We lay the emphasis of our faith on character-building. We believe that character is built up by the combined forces of truth and love. Through the influence of spiritual and ethical truths which are at once laws and motives, and of personal religious character in which these truths find a living embodiment, we seek to educate the mind and the heart in the knowledge and love of true holiness. Not by the conquest of a naturally godless nature, but by the growth and development of that divine sonship which is the birthright of every human being, we believe the kingdom of God is coming, and is to come. Whatever, therefore, helps to bring Christian truth into contact with the open mind of childhood and to apply the force of personal character to the child's emotional and affectional nature is the best and most effective work which a Christian church or a body of Christian churches can do. This work is the work of the Sunday-school; and the organization which stimulates, sustains, and improves this kind of work is, from the point of stand of our Unitarian faith, the best possible sort of home missionary society.

Your educational home missionary body is the Unitarian Sunday School Soci-

Hosted by Google

ety, which with its approaching sixtieth anniversary is now renewing its youth and quickening its pace. The quality of its new literature has received high commendation in Germany, in England, and from some of the leading secular journals and magazines of our own country. The President of the American Social Science Association, in his opening address at the meeting held in Saratoga a fortnight ago, recommended the general use in Sunday-schools of the ethical manuals published by our Society, and gave a lengthy description of the character and contents of these books. I am almost tempted to say that our publications are better known and appreciated outside our own denomination than by large numbers of those who profess and call themselves Unitarians. The Society's recent contributions to the liturgy, the hymnology, and the music of the Sunday-school have been widely used and well spoken of. Its new Sunday-school paper, the *Every Other Sunday*, has been pronounced by unprejudiced judges to be the very best publication of its kind. Its special missionary work in aiding and building up new and feeble schools and in the free circulation of its literature has been rapidly outgrowing its pecuniary resources. By the removal of its head-quarters to the commodious and conspicuous book-room assigned for its use in the new Unitarian Building in Boston, it is now furnished with means and appliances for the better carrying on of its work, that before were beyond its reach. Its publications are now practically sold at cost prices; and it, therefore, looks to the churches which it serves to meet the expenses of its simple but efficient business machinery.

For three successive years, we have received annual contributions from one hundred societies and schools, amounting each year to about $3,500. This sum, however, is less than two-thirds of the comparatively small amount, $5,000, recommended four years ago by the National Conference, and actually needed for the effective doing of our work.

We wait in hope for the united and generous support of *all* our Unitarian societies. We wait with sobered expectation for bequests and endowments to enable us to enlarge the scope and increase the efficiency of our labors, and to tide us over the shallows when the stream of contributions shrinks from a river to a rivulet. And while we wait, bating no jot of heart or hope, we shall go on doing with our might our nearest tasks, to the end that *truth and righteousness*, *love and faith*, *worship and godliness*, may be built up in the minds and hearts of those who are by and by to be the life and support of the Unitarian Church of America.

Hosted by Google

REPORT OF THE WESTERN UNITARIAN SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY.

BY MRS. ELLEN T. LEONARD, SECRETARY.

THE principal activity of the Sunday School Society of the West has been in the business relations it has held with the several branches of Unitarian work in the West. It has not been putting forth the kind of work which speaks forcibly in a condensed report. Neither has it been in any sense inactive.

The regular meetings of its Board of Directors, held each month, the full attendance and earnest interest of its members, have made the last two years a time of steady though quiet growth.

The Western Unitarian Head-quarters is the local centre for the work done by the Western Conference, the Unity Publishing Committee, the Women's Conference, and the Sunday School Society, besides the publishing room of C. H. Kerr & Co., under whose charge *Unity* is issued weekly. The care of these rooms is in the hands of the Sunday School Society. This includes the clerking and book-keeping necessary to its relations with the several different branches, the sale of its own and their publications, together with the hospitalities in connection with the general home-keeping.

Besides its own publications, it has had on sale those of the Sunday School Society in Boston and of the Sunday School Association in London. At these rooms are held Directors' meetings, committee meetings, and Union Teachers' meetings. The latter have occurred each Monday noon, from twelve to one. They have been attended by the pastors and teachers from the four Unitarian Sunday-schools of the city. About twenty-five have been the average number present, and the lessons have been carried on under the uniform topic system.

At the beginning of this year, a new department was added to the business of the Society. Its previous connection with the Colegrove Book Company had given ready access for itself and customers to all books of Unitarian interest. With the general breaking up of this Company January 1, and the removal of the head-quarters, it became necessary for the Society to assume the care of a book trade of its own. It now carries, therefore, a stock of books on sale from the American Unitarian Association and George H. Ellis, besides a miscellaneous line of distinctly liberal books purchased at the time of removal.

It is to be remembered that the Sunday School Society is a *missionary* body; and, in order to place church and Sunday-school material within the reach of newly growing parishes, books and publications must be sold at barely enough profit to cover the expenses of handling,— sometimes there is not enough to cover even that. Whatever business it carries on, whether selling its own publications or acting as agent for other societies, itself is only an instrument for promoting the growth of Unitarianism in the West, not for making money. The Society, therefore, is dependent for its income upon its individual memberships, its contributions from the churches and Sunday-schools it seeks to serve, and the sums

Hosted by Google

paid each year by the Conference and the Women's Conference in return for the housekeeping services rendered at the head-quarters. The combined income from these sources averages from four to five hundred dollars per year. Add to this the small margin of profit on sales; and the result is in all some seven hundred dollars, out of which all expenses must be met except the item of rent for the other three occupants.

Since the wants of the schools have been so ably supplied with publications from the Boston Society, those of the Western Society have been but few. At the time of making report here in 1884, a series of Sunday-school lessons on "The Childhood of Jesus," by W. C. Gannett, was about to be issued. This appeared in November, 1884. Following this came a pamphlet on Sunday-school methods, and later another upon "Worship," being three sermons read before the annual Conference in May, 1885. In November, also a short drama, suitable for children to enact in connection with Sunday-school concerts, was issued. Christmas and New Year's cards made ready for the holidays; and questions for the Union Lesson courses, printed on slips for class distribution, have been supplied each year. Revised editions of five former publications have been required during this time.

The lessons which have been most used are the first three and last four series. The latter are the four sets of "The Childhood of Jesus," last published; and the former, "Corner-stones of Character," "School Life," and "Home Life." Class cards have been much used for the primary classes. All the publications of this Society may be examined at one of the tables in the vestibule of this church.

An expression used in an annual report to the secretary from one of the schools about its year's work indicates our condition. It was, "All work is inside work in our school, whether studying the higher life or putting it into practice." This Society is in that stage of development where its present growth must be through inside work; and, in following this line for itself, it must necessarily develop the inner life of its schools.

Its Board of Directors is earnestly studying to direct its work in such lines as shall bring about the closest and most helpful mutual relations between the Society and its schools. There is now ample material to meet that class of wants which is answered by suitable text-tools to work *with*. *Exterior* conditions for doing that work must rest in the hands of the schools and churches themselves. It is for the Society, then, to study those principles wherefrom the foundations of a growing efficiency spring; to seek to develop that relation which shall best promote co-operation for common purposes. Frank, friendly correspondence is an indispensable means for such development. But, with limited means and few hands, this has been unavoidably kept in a narrower business groove than has been for the larger interests of the work. About two-thirds of the schools in our boundaries are small, scattered, and in need of just such personally friendly and helpful relations as a Sunday School Society aims to establish. The growing toward each other is a thing of slow, gradual progress.

A knowledge of the condition of the schools has been gathered each year by means of question blanks distributed in April. From fifty to sixty are sent out. While these are filled and returned by only about half the number on an average, those which are filled do, for the most part, show thorough work and genuine interest.

It was with reference to making the last annual report in May one which should reflect the inner life of the schools rather than enumerate the details of

Hosted by Google

its outward construction that the questions upon the blanks mailed were of a somewhat different character from those used in former years. They related to the principles involved in the working forces of the schools more than to the net results, which may be counted off upon finger and thumb.

It is sometimes said that day-schools are better governed than Sunday-schools; that there is a lack of order, promptness, regularity, attention, general discipline, etc., in the latter, which would not be tolerated in the former. This is not so wholly undeserved as it should be. A reproach upon a conscience question in Sunday-school and church is a particularly serious matter, since they are institutions for the special promotion of better conscience work in the world. The above-mentioned virtues,— order, promptness, etc.,— which go to make the integrity of an individual or, no less, a body of individuals, are not inherent in a Sunday-school merely by virtue of its bearing the name of Sunday-school. An honorable name lived up to is its owner's blessing. Not lived up to, it becomes his worst enemy. A school must be in its own practice that which its name represents, or it is the vainest of vanities.

To glean, then, a few of the main points touching the conscience life of the schools, the following summary may be presented: —

In this matter of discipline, a thorough appreciation of its value seems to be apparent; but orderly results are believed to be best obtained by the least possible show of rules and regulations. If the principles themselves are firmly wrought in the character of him who holds his school in the hollow of his hand, they will reappear in that school quietly, naturally, with little or no external friction. If they are not so inwrought, no amount of external rules can, under his charge, cause the spirit of integrity to prevail in that school.

In nearly every case, the schools are *self-supporting*, their expenses being defrayed by their own collections each week. The church, in most cases, adds a contribution on festival Sundays; but some have only their regular collection. *Accurate records* of these collections and expenses are kept more often than formerly.

The influence of both *worship and instruction* in the school hour is thought to be so equally essential that stress should be laid upon neither, but the two be blended so as to prove helpful each to the other.

The *general management* is one which springs from a wholesome mixture of vigorous discussion and harmonious action. The relation between teacher and scholar is often one of week-day friendship as well as Sunday instruction, which is an advantage to both. The decided growth in attendance is believed to have sprung from increasing earnestness of teacher and minister, with better co-operation on the part of parents.

The *wants* most deeply felt are still, as they were two years ago, more manifestation of interest from the parents, closer relations between church and Sunday-school, and the more thorough establishment of teachers' meetings. There is a manifest improvement in each of these defects, but the effort toward a stronger inner life in both society and schools is believed to be the right direction of energy toward the gradual *removal* of these deficiencies. Following the *dis*couragements may be presented the *en*couragements. Nearly all the most successful work done locally has been of the kind which, being wrought *into* a school, has been also wrought *out* again through its individuals into the community surrounding it. It is not so much through new lines of work as through better work in the old lines that a freshening of conscience life takes place, and a more appreciable outgo is yielded for the income.

Hosted by Google

Where energy of outgo is kept closely contingent upon adequacy of income, the most efficient life is lived. It may be a school or an individual that lives the life. The outgo and income may refer to spiritual or financial concerns. The principle remains the same.

The points wherein encouragement is seen are as follows: —

The *libraries* are having better care year by year. Good missionary work has been done through them. They have been sources of genuine help and instruction to the homes wherein the books have entered.

The *music* has been reported as steadily gaining in quality; and, by means of classes and concerts, it has been seen that school, church, and home have been drawn by it into more mutual interest. Where *teachers' meetings* have existed with any reasonable degree of vigor, which have been in about half the schools, they have had a recognized and thoroughly appreciable influence. This has been apparent not only in the class work, but in the element of broader study, more inclusive application of thought, which has been brought into home and Unity circle life. The outside *missionary* work of the schools has been well sustained. All this kind of growth is considered as fundamental for the purposes of a healthy Sunday-school as is the Bible knowledge gained. The quality of thought and action existing in the *Sunday*-school should be sufficiently clear, strong, and characteristic to establish direct connections between itself *as* a Sunday-school and the *every-day* life of each student and teacher. The more forcibly this is felt and worked out, the more valuable becomes the mission of these schools.

For a part of the winter's work of the Society at the head-quarters, a few small publications are projected; but it will be better to let them speak for themselves in the general field, when issued, than to name them here. The list of wants, already in demand, but awaiting the expansion of our purse, must also remain unread.

The value of the work of a Sunday School Society is not yet generally recognized in our comparatively new field of work. It must become better understood. There must be a clearer recognition of the fact that the efficiency of such a missionary body can be only in proportion to the cordial support given by church and school. These will bring stronger mutual relations, and therefore a better adaptation of work.

Hosted by Google

RECEPTION OF FOREIGN DELEGATES.

REPORT OF ADDRESSES BY REV. GEORGE VANCE SMITH, D.D., MR. GEORGE W. RAYNER WOOD, AND REV. STOPFORD WENTWORTH BROOKE, DELEGATES FROM THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION; REV. ALFRED STEINTHAL, OF MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

UPON Rev. James De Normandie, as Chairman of the Council, was laid the pleasing task of introducing the foreign delegates. Mr. De Normandie said: "The Council has laid upon me a most pleasant duty, perhaps to compensate for a good many perplexing questions that have been before us. The most delightful feature in this Conference is always when the hour comes for us to welcome those who from some other associations and from some other countries have come in the interest of our common cause. Perhaps the greatest theological work of the present generation has been the publishing of the revised edition of the Scriptures. Of those who did this scholarly work, one member was appointed from the Unitarian body in England, and one member from the Unitarian body in this country. Last winter, a member of that body said to me that the two Unitarian members were regarded by them all as easily chief among that whole body of scholars. One of them, the member from our American Unitarian body, died recently, and is still mourned by all scholars. The other is present with us to-day, and I know I need not ask your welcome. It is already overflowing. I introduce to you Rev. G. Vance Smith, of Carmarthen, Wales."

ADDRESS OF REV. GEORGE VANCE SMITH, D.D.

Ladies and Gentlemen,— It has seldom been my fortune to stand up to address such an audience as this; and I hope, if I discharge the little task committed to me less completely than I ought to do, that your kind indulgence will be extended to the imperfection. I have the pleasure of bringing to you a friendly and brotherly greeting from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association of London. I do so with the utmost satisfaction and pleasure, because I know that I come to those who are animated by the love of truth and liberty, and most earnest and generous in the work which they do for the benefit of their fellow-men. We constantly read of your work on this side of the water, and we look with admiration and with sympathy upon what you are doing. We hear of the great generosity with which you give, not only your money,— the exceeding greatness of the amounts which you are able to give in this cause is most remarkable to us,— not only money, but time and strength and intellectual labor in different ways. We look with the utmost sympathy and admiration upon the work which you are doing in this way, and your example is a great example to us. It is a great help and stimulus to us amid the somewhat difficult circumstances with which we have to labor on the other side of the water. We have difficulties of a peculiar kind from which you are happily free. We have our great national establishment of religion; and, although I am unwilling to suppose that our clergy are actuated by any conscious motive of a pecuniary kind, yet I cannot help

Hosted by Google

saying that, when a set of old creeds and articles, which have come down to us from the Middle Ages and been embodied in our theological system of the Established Church, has been endowed to the extent of £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 per annum, it is extremely likely that that system will be supported by money and kept up where it is, and supported without due consideration of the character which belongs to it. We know very well how difficult it has been for clergymen from time to time to give up the work, the position, the social rank which belong to the establishment. We know the great difficulty which such men as Stopford Brooke and others whom I might name, beginning with Theophilus Lindsay in the last century,—we know the sacrifice which those men have had to make in giving up their position in the Established Church. That is the kind of influence which we have to work against. I need not tell you that nearly all the wealth, a great portion of the rank and influence of the country, belong to the Established Church, and cling to it and support it, because it is established. The same thing may be said, to some extent, of the nonconformist bodies. We have difficulties with them. They call themselves free churches, and you might suppose that they might be more ready to listen to the arguments which we have to lay before them than those who are bound to the old established creeds. But, alas! such is not the case, because the influence of the old established creeds has come down to us, and is embodied in the trust-deeds of the different denominations; and they hold to them, and must hold to them, because, if a man should give up the doctrines there embodied in those deeds, he naturally forfeits the position and all the influence and wealth which are connected with it.

These are the influences against which we have to contend in the old country, from which, to a very large extent, though perhaps not altogether, you are free on this side of the water. As I said before, the example of your energy, the life and the generosity with which you work here, are a great stimulus and a great motive to us, and a great help to us in the work we have to do. I have great pleasure in submitting to you this greeting from our friends in England, because I come to those who are worthy — entirely worthy — to receive this greeting; and I come from those whom I believe to be equally worthy, because our people in England are animated by the same upright spirit of liberty, the same love of truth and righteousness, which are at work among you. It is with the utmost satisfaction that I assure you of their brotherly fellowship.

Farther, I venture to say for myself that I have peculiar pleasure in coming over to this country, and in seeing with my own eyes the life, the energy, the greatness, which are everywhere apparent. I have been impressed and amazed more than I can find words to say by what I have seen. Entering this noble country of yours by that great portal of Niagara, I have come on through some of your great cities, such as Buffalo, Albany, New York, ending with your noble Boston; and I have everywhere seen what has surprised me exceedingly,— traces of life and energy and wealth and greatness of which we have no conception on our side of the water. But one thing in particular gives a grateful feeling to an English visitor, and that is to find that he is among those who speak his own language. He is among friends who are themselves almost English by the blood that is in their veins. It is like coming home again to find that we are among those who are so much one with ourselves in many of the most important essentials of national life. I have been particularly impressed and pleased with all that I have seen in this respect; and I must say that, although Old England has done a great deal in her time, during the last eight hundred years of her exist-

Hosted by Google

ence, among the things she has done, the greatest of all, the one of which we are proudest, is that we have been the founders of the United States of America. [Applause.] I do not wish to say anything that is unduly flattering to you or boastful of my own country, but the greatest of all is what I have just said. It is the proudest thing in our history. The best wish I can utter in your behalf is that you may prove yourselves worthy of the great inheritance which has come down to you in this noble country, extending over half the world, as it does, which is full of riches of every kind, and which only needs uprightness, truth, and honesty, as life, will, and energy, in those who possess it, to be the greatest of all the countries of the world. I say this with the utmost sincerity, and I am proud and glad to think that you have our blood in your veins. We are proud to belong to you as you belong to us. [Applause.]

I ought, perhaps, before I sit down, to say two or three words to introduce the gentlemen who are my colleagues in this representation of our Association. One name — that of Mr. Wentworth Brooke, the son of Rev. Stopford Brooke, of London — is well known to you, a great and honored name on both sides of the Atlantic. My other colleague, Mr. George William Rayner Wood, is the son, the grandson, and the great-grandson of ancestors who have been eminent in their own country for the services they have rendered to civil and religious liberty. Mr. Wood's grandfather was the minister at Leeds in the pulpit which was filled for some time by the eminent scholar and philosopher, Dr. Priestley. In this pulpit, Mr. Wood's grandfather labored for several years. His father has been eminent, not only for the service which he has rendered to our denomination, but to the cause of civil and religious liberty in our country. Mr. Wood himself is a worthy follower in the steps of his forefathers, and I have great pleasure in introducing him to your notice. I thank you for the kindness with which you have received my remarks; and, if I have only imperfectly conveyed my message, I hope you will forgive its imperfection.

ADDRESS OF MR. RAYNER WOOD, OF MANCHESTER.

My Friends,— I feel it a very great honor to have been asked by our Association to represent it here, to-day, before such an assemblage of our brother Unitarians of the United States and Canada. My coming here, on this occasion, was somewhat accidental. The Association rather took the opportunity of my being here in America. I am very glad for one thing. The other delegates are ministers; and I think it is, at any rate, well that you should know that there are among us in England laymen as well as ministers, and that our Association was not obliged to be entirely one-sided in its delegates. I feel it is to no little extent due to my ancestors, of whom Dr. Vance Smith has spoken, that I have been honored by this invitation here. I feel sure that you will not, at the very beginning of the proceedings, expect me to say much. Speaking personally, I can only say that I have largely come here with the wish to learn. American Unitarianism has shown a life and vitality from which we in England have very much to learn, and this I want to do. I thank you very much for receiving me.

Mr. De Normandie: "A few years ago, I had the pleasure of meeting a captain of the British Army, a brother of Frederick Robertson, who, twenty years ago, was perhaps the minister who had most influence among the younger ministers of that time. Just about that time, a memoir of Mr. Robertson had come

Hosted by Google

out; and I asked his brother something about the author of it. He said he was a member of the Established Church, who seemed to be following, even in a still more liberal vein, the teachings of his brother. Since then, you all know how Rev. Stopford Brooke has gone on as a leader of liberal thought in England, until not long ago he felt it was a duty he could no longer resist to go to the head-quarters of the British Unitarian Association and there enroll his name as one of our ministers. We have his son present with us to-day; and it is the desire of every one of this audience to welcome the son, not only for the father's sake, but for his own promise." (Applause.)

ADDRESS OF REV. STOPFORD WENTWORTH BROOKE.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,— Dr. Vance Smith has spoken so well of the general condition of Unitarianism in England, and both he and the other delegate are so much older than myself and have been so much longer connected with Unitarianism in England, that I am sure I should not detain you with remarks of my own. As I am one of its delegates, I ought to thank you, in the name of the Association, for the very kind greeting you have given us. When I first left England, an old friend of my family, well known as a lecturer here, assured me that I should find the greeting I received in America most kind. He said he had travelled a great deal in all civilized countries, and that he had nowhere received so kind and so hospitable a welcome as in America. I have to thank you in my own person for the truth of that practical assurance, and not only in my own person, but as representing the British and Foreign Association.

In introducing me, the Chairman was kind enough to refer to me as bearing a certain name. It would be very unbecoming in me not to thank you in the name of my father for the way in which you have received his son. I am sure the best thanks I can give for that reception is to make a promise that I will try to keep the name as honorable as it has hitherto been. [Applause.] I will not detain you any longer. The time is coming for other necessities than this, and it would be wrong for me by any speech of mine to keep you from them. I can only thank you again for this reception, and say that the best way to show my appreciation of your kindness is to get as much good as I can from these meetings. [Applause.]

The Chairman then introduced Rev. Alfred Steinthal, of Manchester, England, as one who had been welcomed before at the Conference, and whom they were glad to welcome again.

ADDRESS OF REV. ALFRED STEINTHAL.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,— I can only say that there is certainly, in a republic like this, no individual liberty. The power by which we are called up, whether we are delegates or not, shows what arbitrary rule can mean [laughter]; and I am bound, when crossing the Atlantic, as I shall be in a few days, to remember how you have exercised that authority. Yet how can I stand here without thanking those who are gathered in this assembly,— and some who are not here, but with whom I have held such pleasant intercourse during the last few weeks,— without thanking you all most cordially for that kind and genial hospitality that you always offer to those who come to you from our side of the

Hosted by Google

Atlantic? I can only say that I believe you have trained yourselves in the most experienced arts of flattery. [Laughter.] You seem always to know all about us, who we are and what we have done [laughter]; and, when we come these thousands of miles across the Atlantic, it is almost like knowing something of posthumous fame to be so greeted, as we all of us are. [Laughter.] It is almost as if we could see a sermon translated into the French. Just think of what an honor is conferred! Perhaps we ought to remember that we can read in Shakspere that it was Bottom who was translated; and that, after all, it is not such a great credit to us. [Laughter.] Having thus expressed my own feelings and deep sense of your kindness, allow me to assure you that I take with me, not only these present friendly recollections, but deeper impressions from this gathering; and, as the secretary of our National Conference in England, I have learned some lessons here to-day and I trust shall be of greater use on the other side of the Atlantic, because you have allowed me the privilege of spending a few hours here with you. I thank you for your greeting, and I shall ever bear this day in mind. [Applause.]

Hosted by Google

SERMON AND ESSAYS.

THE DIVINE SUFFICIENCY.

BY REV. JOHN W. CHADWICK.

I ENTER on my task this evening painfully conscious of the disappointment we have all experienced in having been denied the privilege of hearing from the lips of Dr. Hedge the initial word of this delightful and impressive convocation. Of this, however, I am sure: that no one could occupy his place to whom his friendship and affection have been more than they have been to me, and no one whose admiration of his character and genius is greater than my own. May I speak no word that shall not meet with the approval of his just and noble mind! But for whatever I may say I trust that no one but myself will be held in any degree responsible.

For the suggestion of my theme, I am indebted to a sentence in Paul's second letter to the Corinthians, "Our sufficiency is of God." Its suggestions are for you and me quite different, perhaps, from those it quickened in the minds of Paul's Corinthian disciples. The questions which engaged, the problems which beset, the anxieties which disturbed their minds and hearts, were very different from the questions, problems, and anxieties which engage, beset, disturb, our minds and hearts. Nevertheless, the words, just as Paul spoke them to the Corinthians, are as true to-day as ever. His contrast, his antithesis, was between God and man. "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves," he said, "to do anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God." That is a truth whose value or importance does not change from age to age. Paul frequently returned to it, and embodied it in some of his most glorious phrases: "In Him we live and move and have our being," "One God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in us all." It may well be doubted whether Jesus ever said, "I and my Father are one," whether in "a jubilee of sublime emotion" or in any other mood. But that he might have spoken so without extravagance there can be no doubt. Certainly, Mr. Herbert Spencer is not given to extravagance; and his recent declaration that the Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed is the same that wells up in us as consciousness is only an abstract and philosophical way of saying, "I and my Father are one." But this order of ideas is capable of being easily abused. Its abuse is quietism, antinomianism, the sentiment that doing is a deadly thing,—our doing only interferes with God's.

Hosted by Google

Swedenborg was never wiser than when he declared, "All goodness is from the Lord, but we are obliged to think of it as from ourselves,"— a saying to which one of Goethe's is a natural appendix, "Whom God deceives is well deceived." Men had much better believe that there is no God at all than believe that they can delegate to him the least of their responsibilities. No phrases and no anecdotes are better worth our cherishing than those which signify the value and necessity of our human toil and sweat,— such, for example, as Luther's, "God cannot get along without strong men"; and his prayer, "Thy will and *mine* be done." The men who have prayed in this fashion, who have identified their wills with the Eternal's, have been among the stoutest helpers of mankind. "Pray as if God did everything; work as if God did nothing," is another of these pungent sayings. The necessity for such sharp reminders resides in the continual forgetfulness of our optimistic pantheism that the human is a part of the divine.

"Why labor at the dull mechanic oar,
When the fresh breeze is blowing
And the strong current flowing
Right onward to the eternal shore?"

Why but because, though nothing can be done without divine co-operation, as little can be done without our own co-operation with the Eternal Power.

But, in this attempt to speak of the Divine Sufficiency, I have in mind, not the Pauline antithesis of God and Man, in his sense at any rate, but certain antitheses of our modern life. And these I can best bring to your attention by asking the straightforward question, If our sufficiency is not of God, whence is it? If God is not sufficient for our thought, our faith, our hope, our steadfastness, who or what is? The churches, for the most part, answer, Christ. Sometimes, they answer, God and Christ. Whether they answer Christ or God and Christ, they equally deny the fulness and completeness of the Divine Sufficiency. But some, perhaps, will say that I am calling spirits from the vasty deep, that I am summoning the dead and buried to appear again upon this mortal scene. No: I am not. There has been much amelioration of the harsher aspects of the evangelical theology, and much, also, of its intellectual absurdities. Of the trinity we hear very little; of election and reprobation and total depravity and eternal punishment, still less. But, even where there is some abatement of intellectual extravagance in speaking of the nature and offices of Jesus, there is no abatement of sentimental extravagance. It was not the most conservative, it was the most liberal of Orthodox Congregationalists who demanded, about thirty years ago, "Can Theodore Parker worship my God?" and went on to say: "Christ Jesus is his name. All that there is for me of God is bound up in that name. A dim and shadowy effluence rises from Christ, and that to me is the Father. A yet more invisible and intangible film of thought arises, and that is the Holy Spirit. But neither is to me"— At this point, my memory fails; but the idea I remember, and

Hosted by Google

it was that neither God nor Spirit was to him anything satisfactory as compared with Jesus Christ. Here was no isolated phrase. The expression was unusually felicitous; but the ideas it conveyed were almost as common as the embracing air. Many and great have been the theological changes in the three decades that have passed since Mr. Beecher wrote those words. But, with all of his changes, he would undoubtedly revert to them to-day without the least misgiving; while, for the majority of his co-religionists, they have been as a banner lifted up, which they have pressed around. And the most liberal have been as eager in the press as the most conservative, if not the eagerest of all. A sign of this condition is apparent in the coinage of a new word. It was unknown to theological controversy and exposition a few years ago, and now we come upon it frequently. It is "Christocentric." It is a favorite word with those who call their own theology "progressive orthodoxy." It is accounted among these a sign of progress that their theology is "Christocentric," — that it makes Christ, and not God, the central person and the central term. The word "Christocentric" has an astronomical origin. The Ptolemaic system of astronomy was *geocentric;* that is, it declared the earth to be the central body of the stellar universe. The Copernican system was *heliocentric;* that is, it declared the sun to be the central body. So, when the theologians declare that a true theology is Christocentric, not Theocentric, they declare that Christ, and not God, is the central being of the moral universe, and that our sufficiency is not of God, but of the historic person who was born in Nazareth and was crucified in Jerusalem about eighteen centuries ago.

It is impossible for any thoughtful observer not to see in this theological tendency an element of religious doubt, verging upon despair of ultimate realities. There is here a kind of veiled agnosticism. I have had confession made to me by worshippers of Jesus that they worship him in despair of any knowledge of the Eternal. "If there were not a God," said Voltaire, "we should have to invent one." And our evangelical contemporaries have acted on this hint. Without God in the world, they have invented one. They have made one out of Jesus. But there is another aspect. There are those to whom Jesus is no substitute for God, but himself the Lord God Omnipotent. And there are also those for whom, either as a substitute for the Eternal or as identical with Him, the historic Jesus is not to be named, is not to be thought of. Their sufficiency is of God.

To these, a theology that is Christocentric is not merely such a blunder in theology as a geocentric astronomy is in astronomy. It is infinitely worse than this. For the historic Jesus bears no such relation to the Eternal Father as the earth bears to the sun. Time was when those who were persuaded that theology must be Theocentric, that God must be the centre of religion, were still disposed to say that Jesus was the Jupiter of lesser lights, a second sun of magnitude and splendor hardly less than that which is the father of lights. But the hour cometh and now is when there are

Hosted by Google

many thousands to whom such a proposition is unspeakably absurd; to whom a Christocentric theology is the equivalent of an astronomy that should represent the sun, not as revolving round the earth, but as revolving round some mountain of the Alps, the Andes, the Himalayas. In the old geographies, Jerusalem was represented as the centre of the earth and of the world. A Christocentric theology finds its astronomic parallel in such a puerility as that. Only through total inability to feel the awful grandeur of the Infinite and Eternal Power can it be imagined for one moment that it was exhausted or uniquely represented by the historic personality of Jesus. Why, if the only world were this little baby planet of our own, if the only day of time were this one day of ripening autumn weather, it would be horrible to impute the force that could organize such a world and such a day as this to any individual soul, albeit the greatest that was ever tabernacled in the flesh! O friends, still cherishing the old-time faith, so shocked and pained at our irreverence for Jesus when we assert his pure humanity, can you not see that your assertion of his deity is to us so monstrously irreverent to man, the universe, and God, that we have no language to express our sense of its intolerable presumption and conceit? Can you not see that your greatness of Jesus means to us the littleness of man, the universe, and God? It is not for any of us to lift our minds and hearts up to the level of their grandeur and sublimity; but, if we can only lift them just a little way, if we can only have some faintest possible perception of what Man is, and what the Universe is, and what God is, we should want, for very shame, to bow our faces in the dust to think that we had ever dared imagine that the prophet-soul of Jesus was too great for our humanity, and great enough to be the Infinite and Everlasting God. This thought has been the grand irreverence of human history.

But it is not as if the Christocentric theologians and religionists had no answer whatsoever to make to this apostrophe. Their answer is that, if power and majesty could satisfy the mind and heart, then their sufficiency might be of God. But power and majesty do not satisfy the mind and heart. At any rate, they do not satisfy the heart. The heart must have goodness, it must have kindness, it must have tenderness, it must have love. And these they do not find in nature or in nature's God. They find immeasurable power, they find unspeakable majesty. But these things are not enough, and Robert Browning tells the reason why: —

> "For the loving worm within its clod
> Were diviner than a loveless God
> Amid his worlds, I will dare to say."

The objection is well taken. It must be, as a brilliant writer has of late so much insisted, that God is Good; and a God that was not good would be no God for us. All that the astronomers have ever told of the sidereal universe might be impressed upon our minds; all that the evolutionist has ever shown of the progression from the fire-mist to the ascidian,

Hosted by Google

and from the ascidian to the saint, and the worship of Jesus or of any other good and loving man, would be infinitely nobler and sweeter and higher than worship of the God of such a progression, such a universe, if to his power and his intelligence, albeit infinite, he could not add the attributes of goodness and of love. We shall not better Browning's lines which have been quoted once already: —

> "For the loving worm within its clod
> Were diviner than a loveless God
> Amid his worlds, I will dare to say."

And still the "loving worm" would not be much for us to stay our hearts upon in times of bitter need. But the loving Jesus is a very different matter. Yes, but still terribly inadequate. A loveless God, a loveless universe, plus a loving Jesus, would still be an indefinitely depressing whole. Our sufficiency may not be of God; but, certainly, it is not of Jesus, his relation to God being as thus described. But the sufficiency of Jesus, we are told, consists in this: that his goodness and his love are a manifestation of the goodness and the love of God.

Amen and Amen! But, if the goodness and the love of Jesus were the only manifestation of the goodness and the love of God, how ill-sufficient he would be for us in the distress and pain and sorrow of our hearts! And by what token can it be satisfactorily shown that the goodness and the love of Jesus are a manifestation of the goodness and the love of God, which is not equally available for showing that all goodness and all love are equally a manifestation of the Infinite and Eternal Power? And, verily, they are so. There is nothing that appears which is not the phenomenon of Noumenon,— the manifestation of the Eternal Spirit of the world. So long as men think and speak as if external nature were the only manifestation of this Spirit, however confident they may be of its power and beauty, they cannot be confident of its goodness and its love. God cannot get along without strong men,— men strong in goodness and in love. I mean that the God of our ideal conception needs a human element to give us refuge from the pitiless immensity of nature in her extra-human manifestation. And there is no reason under heaven why man should be cut off from nature as a thing distinct and separate. As well cut off rock-nature from the rest, or cloud-nature, or tree-nature, or bird-nature, as to cut off human nature. Man is a part of nature. The same laws that operate in rock and cloud and tree and bird operate in his body; and his body operates upon his mind, his conscience, and his heart. And, as external nature is a manifestation of the Eternal Power, equally so is man. And, as external nature manifests the eternal strength and beauty, so human nature manifests the eternal goodness and love, and manifests them in so many thousand, in so many million, forms (not in the life of Jesus only) that we can be as sure as mathematics of the goodness and the love of God. There was strength and beauty in the artist's work, while he was still con-

Hosted by Google

tent to picture only rocks and trees and clouds and nature's general outwardness; but he did not less express himself, but vastly more, when he put men and women into it, beaming with love, thrilling with tenderness. And, to compare great things with small, think you the Infinite Artist puts less of himself into his work, when to his rocks and trees and clouds and nature's general outwardness he adds his men and women, beaming with love, thrilling with tenderness, radiant with goodness, faithful unto death? Not less, but infinitely more. The stream cannot rise higher than its fountain. Yet a single stream of goodness and of love, albeit one so deep and full as Jesus' wondrous heart, would not bespeak a fountain equal to our need. But when to that we add a hundred thousand — ay, a million million — other streams, freshening and gladdening and fructifying centuries of time and all the planet's breadth with various truth and good, then wonderful indeed and glorious must be the fountain from which all these streams proceed, and adequate for all our thirst; and the words of the apostle take on such a richness and profundity of meaning as they never had before,— "Our sufficiency is of God!"

If not of God, surely not of the historic Jesus, one glorious manifestation, out of a multitude that no man can number, of the Infinite Reality. As substitute or as exponent, there is no sufficiency in him. There are those who would assent to this as readily as any, who still imagine *their* sufficiency to be from nature or humanity. But Nature is not, you will observe, the gracious, perfect being she appears to be, seen from the standpoint of a sentimental admiration. Her leagues of forest, dappled so pleasantly with sunshine or with shade, conceal a thousand scenes of cruelty. The very joy in her which leads us to contrast her perfectness with our own imperfection is born not of her actuality, but of our idealization. John Stuart Mill's indictment of Nature has an abiding force. If we had forgotten it of late, the cyclones of the early and the earthquake of the later summer would bring it forcibly to mind. The writer, who has attempted in his book called *Natural Religion* the identification of God and Nature more seriously than any other writer of our time, and with results more generally satisfactory, owes his success, not in a small degree, to his perception that a Nature-God without man in the world would not be altogether worshipful. Life-giving and beneficent he would surely be, but terrifying and destructive also; and "Nature, red in tooth and claw with ravine," shrieks against the creed of those who would assert her absolute perfection or sufficient good. Certainly, our sufficiency is not of Nature in her extra-human manifestations. For all her mountains and her seas, her forests and her streams, her palpitating firmament of stars, her morning freshness and her evening splendors, for all that Turner ever painted or essayed to paint in vain, for all that Wordsworth ever sang or tried to sing, for all that music can express of heart-felt rapture and delight in natural things, the loving heart of Jesus or of any loving man — ay, or "a loving worm within its clod," if that were possible — would be more

Hosted by Google

worshipful than the whole of Nature's wide expanse and infinite variety apart from human goodness, human thoughtfulness and tenderness and love. If there are those who find in such expanse and such variety all that they need, it must be that they have never loved or lost a friend; or it must be that they wofully deceive themselves, and that He who gives to his beloved while they sleep gives to their hearts, below their conscious depths, comforts and consolations of which they do not take account. But, even if the wide expanse and infinite variety of outward nature were sufficient for the highest hearts, seeing that nature is but the living garment by which the Deity is seen, it would still be nearer to the fact to say, "Our sufficiency is of God," than to say, "Our sufficiency is of nature," thus crediting the manifesting power, and not the manifested beauty, the artist, not the picture, with the gladness of our hearts.

Natural religion, in the sense of a religion that finds its inspirations and incitements in the face of outward things, has had no sterner critics than the devotees of "the great god — Man," whom they declare to be the only and sufficient object of men's worship, love, and trust. These have laid bare, with pitiless contempt and scorn, the "seamy side" of Nature,— her indifference to human suffering, her rapacities and enormities, her cruelties and malignities. But, while thus critical and rudely surgical with reference to the mote in the eye of Nature-worship, the Worship of Humanity has often been unmindful of the equal mote or beam in its own eye. Humanity, considered as a whole, contains some very questionable parts. If there were faithful women standing by the cross of Jesus, there were also those who thrust the spear into his fainting side. If there is a legend of good women, there is a legend of bad women also. If there was once an Emperor Aurelius, there was also a Tiberius, a Nero, a Caligula, a Claudius, a Domitian. If there was a Francis of Assisi who remembered those whom God seemed to have forgotten, there was an Alexander VI. who forgot everything honorable and decent, in his lust for pleasure and revenge. The humblest ranks of life reveal the same antitheses of good and evil things. No wonder that Comte himself, the founder of the Religion of Humanity, made the astute discovery that the whole of humanity does not mean the whole, "but only those who are really capable of assimilation in virtue of a real co-operation on their part in furthering the common good." By such a limitation, the Great Being Humanity would be shorn of many thousands of his Briarean arms, that have crushed, like coiling serpents, the tender innocency, joy, and gladness of the world. By such a limitation, we are brought again to Mr. Conway's favorite iteration that "God is good," by which he means that good or goodness is the only true God, while the only goodness in the universe, so far as we have yet discovered any, is in man. The Great Being Humanity of the Comtist worship is immeasurably reduced by such a definition. The remainder is the merest fragment of its former self. The Torso of the Vatican is no such maimed, decapitated, armless, legless, and abraded remnant of a once mighty whole.

Hosted by Google

How then? Can we by adding just one letter to the phrase of Paul, so changing God to Good, make a more satisfactory declaration,— Our sufficiency is of Good? The good that has been in humanity, the good that is in humanity, the good that may be in humanity in the boundless future,— this threefold good is ample — shall we say so? — for our every need. We shall say so, if we think it, without hesitation. A religion so conditioned would be an immeasurable advance upon the natural religion that depends wholly upon external nature for its inspiration. It would be hardly less of an advance upon a religion that identifies the historical Jesus with the Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed, or finds in his personal goodness our only warrant for believing in the goodness of the Almighty. Whatever else we do or do not do, let us love, honor, and revere the Good wherever it has been or is; to that which is still present, let us give our generous sympathy and faithful service; to that which is still possible, let us devote ourselves with yearning expectation and unfaltering hope. So doing, we shall play no mean or trivial part in the great order of events; and we shall be well deserving of assimilation with the Collective Good in virtue of a real co-operation with its tendency and spirit. I know that there are some who think, or think they think, who imagine, or imagine they imagine, that they can be content, and even satisfied, with such a part. But I do not believe they understand themselves; and I know that there are some, that there are many, hundreds and thousands at this very hour, who cannot be content or satisfied with such a presentation of religion. The good that has been, that is and that may yet be in human life, is not enough for them. If there is nothing more, then they will bear with the denial and the deprivation as best they can. Because they are not satisfied is to them no argument of something better to be had. They remember the story of the man who said that he must live, and the unsentimental answer that was made to him,— "I do not know that that is necessary." But they will not pretend that they are satisfied when they are not. They will not pretend that, if the actual past and present and potential good in human nature is the only God, they can feel any music lifting at their feet sufficient to make life's march and battle anything but infinitely weary, dark, and sad.

But is it absolutely sure that, paint the logic of the situation with whatever rosy hues we may, to this complexion it must come at length: Good is the only God; and the only good is that of men and women past, present, and to be? I find it anything but so. I find the sureness all upon the other side. I find no such antagonism, no such dualism, between man and nature, as they do who find that human goodness is the only good in all the world.

> "Nature is made better by no mean
> But nature makes that mean; even that art
> Which you say adds to nature is an art
> That nature makes."

Hosted by Google

Our confidence must have the universe itself for a foundation, or it will not stand. And why may it not have it? Do men gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles? Can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit? Do not believe it. If man is sound, the universe is sound; for is he not the fruit of this tree Igdrasil? There is no schism anywhere, no break. "No statement of the universe can have any soundness," Emerson maintained, "which does not admit of its ascending effort." Our effort to ameliorate the hard conditions of the world obeys the impulse which the morning stars had when they sang together,— the same impulse which the cooling earth obeyed, the tides that shaped the continents, the streams that made their channels through the hills, the stream of life from saurian to man. No dualism here! Here is a seamless garment that cannot be rent apart. I and my Mother Earth are one. No break, but everlasting continuity, the universe itself Immanuel, God with us, each and all, yesterday, to-day, and forever.

Our sufficiency is of God. The goodness of humanity, however generously construed, is not enough. We want to feel and to believe that goodness is the inmost heart of things. "The keelson and keel of the creation,— is it not love?" our burly Whitman cries. Yea and amen to that! We must believe it, or we are so many human ostriches,— heads buried in the sand; else every way exposed, what time a thousand arrows fly. We are like men who boast the soundness of their ship,— there is no good but that,— while ocean's bottom is itself withdrawn, and shrivelled like a parchèd scroll. If we cannot trust the whole, it is self-mockery to trust a part.

Our sufficiency is of God. Why is it so? Surely, not because of the manifest and utter insufficiency of the historic Jesus or of outward nature or of humanity or of the sum of human good. No: but because nothing is evolved which is not involved. Wherefore, no human good that glorifies the world is possible that was not there in nature before man began to be, and was not there in the Abyss of Being before the nebulous haze had shaped one flying world. Nay, more: there is no dream of good, no aspiration, no striving of our human strength, which was not there in the Immense Profound. Shall the clay say unto the potter, "Why hast thou made me thus?" Yea, verily, it shall, if it can find a voice; but not without implying by its own divine dissatisfaction the genius of the master's moulding hand. It cannot be that men can hope or yearn or strive for any better thing than was potential in the most structureless condition of the morning world.

Our sufficiency is of God. Why, but because of him and to him and in him are all things? He is the All in all. The historic Jesus, whom so many fain would worship as identical with him or in despair of finding him, is to his fulness as one fairest blossom on a tree in May compared with all the abounding glory of the early summer that cannot be measured by a million million blossoms bursting upon hill and plain. External

Hosted by Google

nature! It is an ever-deepening wonder of transcendent beauty, order, majesty, and law. But taking all that all men know of it together, and would not the ancient scripture be as true as ever,— "Lo, these are a part of his ways; but how little is yet known of him"? And the same would still be true, if every star of all the millions that make night despair were known to us as well as our own tiny earth. Humanity! It is another and a higher manifestation of his infinite life. The Collective Goodness of the world, it is the same Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed, rising in us as consciousness of right and wrong, allying itself with what we know or think we know to be the right. But the goodness that we need for our sufficiency must be of vaster breadth and height and depth than any yet achieved, than any possible for men to reach. And our sufficiency is of God, because in naming Him we name a goodness which is so vast, so infinite, that it can afford all the rapacities of nature, all the malignities of human life, as unimpeached in its own excellence as the symphony of music's greatest master by the attuning discords that prelude its ravishment of harmony. "I think, and therefore I exist." So ran the famous dictum of Descartes. We think this thought of the Divine Sufficiency, and therefore its reality exists, or we, the creatures of a day, can think and will a better thing than the Omnipotent can think and will. Grosser absurdity than this has never been conceived. God must be greater than our hearts and better than our highest dream of good; and so, from out the various sorrow and perplexity and struggle of our lives,— their various gladness, too,— we lift up to Him a voice of confidence and praise, and cry, "Whom have we in heaven but Thee, and there is none on earth that we desire beside Thee!"

The Unitarian opportunity, of which we hear so much,— what is it, if it be not to represent pre-eminently this doctrine of the Divine Sufficiency in the modern world? Honoring the great name of Jesus, his gracious spirit and his mighty work; availing ourselves of all that Science has to tell of the ineffable wonder, mystery, and beauty of the material universe; knowing what a piece of work is man and what a glorious being is the Divine Humanity, which, for perhaps a million years, has been advancing here upon the earth from low to higher things; recognizing to the full the good there is in this humanity, and an ideal of good that puts it all to shame,— it is our Unitarian opportunity to show that all these things — Jesus, Nature, Science, Humanity, the accomplished Good, the ethical passion for a good forever unattained — implicitly, if not explicitly, confess a higher than themselves in which they all inhere, to which, to whom, they point the struggling aspirations of the world, chanting in unison to the thronging multitudes who would fain concentrate upon them the ardors of their faith and hope and love, "Not unto us, but unto the Eternal's high and holy name, be honor and glory, world without end. Amen!"

And, to the end that we may be able ministers of this new covenant, let us remember that the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. Not

Hosted by Google

as a dogma, but as a faith, let us hold fast our confidence in the Divine Sufficiency. For the very reason that we have this confidence, let us trust that it will bring to us our own from near and far. For the very reason that it is so much to our imagination, to our conscience, mind, and heart, and that we would fain communicate the conscious joy of it to an ever-widening company of faithful souls, let us beware of making any phrase or formula of it the test or basis of our religious fellowship. Who does not know that it is not always those who are most God-impressed who are most ready to name Him and define Him and say, "I believe in Him"? He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him. It is an ancient scripture which as yet has not begun to stale. As with our thought of God, so with our hope full of immortality. It is so great and high and pure that we would fain bring into the strength and joy of it many who dare not cherish it, and we can advance our purpose in no surer way than by making clear how blameless we account their present inability to think and feel with us. Endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, let us go onward in the future as we have done in the past, trusting and loving one another in despite of varying interpretations.

"One in the freedom of the truth,
One in the joy of paths untrod,
One in the soul's perennial youth,
One in the larger thought of God;
The freer step, the fuller breath,
The wide horizon's grander view,
The sense of life that knows no death,—
The Life that maketh all things new."

Hosted by Google

OUR CHRISTIAN POSITION AS UNITARIANS.

BY REV. G. VANCE SMITH, D.D.

I DEEM it a great privilege, as it is also no slight honour, to be invited to take part in the present proceedings; and I trust that the words which I have to offer will be found to be in harmony with the general spirit and purpose of this large and representative assembly. The text to which my name is attached is "Our Christian Position," a subject of the highest interest to the Unitarian churches on both sides of the Atlantic. This subject divides itself into two main parts; and in the first place, the point on which I would wish for a few minutes more especially to dwell is the word Christian.

I. Christian, I have no doubt, we would all of us profess to be and desire to be. But the term is one of somewhat vague and elastic import; and it would seem to need something by way of explanation to make it clear; otherwise we may be using the word, or thinking of it, in different senses.

A Christian then is one who is a *disciple* of Christ; — according to the earliest notice of the word which is to be met with, "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." A disciple, again, is one who learns, or has learnt, from another; and who feels himself drawn by the respect and sympathy of a learner towards his teacher. The Christian will entertain such feelings towards Christ; he will look to him with reverence; will desire to imitate the example of faithfulness to the sense of duty and of Love to God and man which he has given to the world.

But what then, it may be asked, is the Christian *to believe?* In reply, I can only say, Christ has left us no formal Creed, nor authorized any person to draw one up for him. Intellectually, therefore, we are free men, much as we are politically or socially; free, that is, to pursue the truth, to think and speak according to our highest perception of truth and right. Such is the "liberty wherewith Christ has made us free." But yet, although the Teacher has imposed no dogmatic creed, he has given us great principles, without the acknowledgment of which no man can justly claim to be his disciple. Pre-eminent among such principles are Love to God and Love to man, and these are what Christ himself has most emphatically enjoined upon us. And he was right in doing so; for these principles involve and lead up to everything else of chief value in the faith and practice of a religious man. Carry them out in the details of daily conduct, carry them out in the spirit of Christ, and they will add a grace and beauty and elevation and purity to human life, which as yet, alas, are too often and too sadly absent from it.

Hosted by Google

While then we are intellectually free as I have said, yet we are bound and pledged to the service of all truth and righteousness, and no man can be a true Christian disciple who neglects this service.

In the earliest use of the word under our notice it had no doubt a somewhat limited and peculiar meaning. A Christian was a CHRIST-ian; and the name alluded to the Christship or Messiahship. Was Jesus of Nazareth the expected Messiah? Many said that he was *not;* but others held that he was, and that in him had come to pass the true fulfilment of ancient prophecy. The disciples who thus received him had their reasons for so doing. Into these I need not enter here; and will only observe that, whatever those reasons were, they were sufficient for the men who accepted Jesus in that great character.

But it is necessary to notice particularly that there were some ideas connected with the Christ of ancient expectation which, in the person of Jesus, were doomed to disappointment. He was not destined to set up a kingdom of temporal power; he was not destined to come again, either to rule or to judge the world; and so far as such earthly elements as these were involved in the Christship, as then understood, and in the name that was founded upon it, they were simply to remain fruitless, and in time to disappear from the world. Most probably, as we may conjecture, the purpose of these temporary Messianic beliefs was to give courage and hope and firmness to the disciples amidst the many adverse circumstances of their position. Although therefore such ideas remained unfulfilled, they cannot be said to have been without their use; and we know that the great Providence of our lives often moves on in its mysterious course even by the medium of human misapprehensions and errors, by hopes and fears in men that issue in no abiding result among the realities of life. So it may have been, so it must have been, with much in that ancient belief in the Hebrew Messiahship. Jesus was indeed to reign, but not in that sense. The early anticipations have not been verified; and *we* are not Christians, cannot be Christians, in that ancient and primitive sense.

But nevertheless, laying aside the unrealized faith thus associated with the Founder of Christianity, there is still left to us all that is of essential and enduring importance to his office, as a spiritual King of men. He stands before us in his own personal character, divested of the artificial elements which national hope, or national pride and ambition associated with him. He stands before us as the Teacher of Divine things, the Exemplar of human duty, the chosen Servant and well-beloved Son of the Almighty Father. He is shewn to have been this by the long experience of eighteen centuries, and by the reverent confession of multitudes of the best men of every age since he lived; and we can receive him, and honour him as Teacher, Saviour, Lord, not because of anything of the temporal or political kind attributed to him by the affection or the misunderstanding of his immediate followers, but for the sake of his own greatness, the beauty and the glory of his own life, the steadfastness with which he

Hosted by Google

served God and man, and left to the world an example that we should follow in his steps.

What Jesus was in his personal character, I need not attempt to set forth in this place. We know it full well. The strength and beauty and clearness of his mind are seen in the simple narratives of the three historical Gospels, which beyond question preserve for us the most original and faithful portraiture of their great subject which is now accessible to us — a picture which, as it stands in those Gospels, is untouched by the philosophical conceptions introduced among the Christians before the end of the first century, as seen in the peculiar thoughts and phraseology of the Fourth Gospel. We learn therefore what the personal, living Jesus was, from the Sermon on the Mount, from the various parables, precepts and prayers, to which he gave utterance, and from that spirit of devout submission to the will of God which he manifested throughout his life and especially in its closing scenes. In all this, and such as this, we have Christianity as it lives in Christ; we have that "spirit of Christ," without which we are none of his; we have that which constitutes him the "great Chief of faithful souls"; and which we may each of us be proud and eager to strive to imitate, and thankful if it should so be that we are counted worthy to be called by Christ's name.

Our Christian position then as Unitarians is one of allegiance to Jesus Christ,— allegiance, that is, to the historical Christ of the Gospels, not the speculative theological Christ of the popular orthodoxy.

And this position, let me now observe, is one of impregnable strength to those who hold it, as against the ordinary theologies of the creeds. For no man, it may surely be said, be he Nicenist, or Athanasian, Calvinist or Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, Anglican, or Presbyterian, will venture to place his own theological system in contrast with the actual teaching of Christ, or presume to exalt the words of ancient or modern creed-makers above the spirit and the word of the Master himself.

In and by this our fealty to the Christian Head we are, as I claim, released from all similar regard for other masters. We would be disciples of Christ alone. If allowed to do so, we would call ourselves simply by His name, and be well satisfied if we could deserve to be Christians, in the highest sense of this term. In the present temper of the religious world, this is not perhaps practicable, and might involve too much of assumption on our part. Hence the necessity for the denominational name which has descended to us from the past, which is founded and always has been founded upon an important distinctive doctrine of our faith, that of the sole and unrivalled Deity of the One Almighty Father.*

To this name I would not, of course, be understood to offer any objection, for in regard to the doctrine which it expresses we only follow Christ himself in maintaining it. The name too is an outspoken and an honest

* I am aware of the obscurity which hangs over the actual origin of the word Unitarian. In the above remarks I refer to the now well-understood and long-established use of the word.

Hosted by Google

one; and it has a fulness of meaning proper to it historically and etymologically; nor can it, I venture to add, be deprived of this definite and long-descended signification, without violence to both history and etymology, as well as to common sense.

We may hope, however, that the day will at length dawn upon the world when simple loyalty to Christ will be held to be sufficient to distinguish the Christian man; when sects and parties will be contented to merge their manifold differences in their confession of the one great Name of Christ, leaving the old distinctions of sect and party to fade away from the thoughts of men, even as the ancient beliefs in the "Gods many and Lords many" of heathen mythology have passed away and are remembered no more.

Here, if I had the space, I might take notice of an objection which some persons will be ready to urge against what has now been said: — to the effect that there are some things in the recorded words of Christ which are not in harmony with the highest dictates of the individual mind. For example, the anthropomorphic language in which he sometimes speaks of God; the immediate efficacy which he appears to ascribe to faith and prayer; his belief in the existence and the power of demons; and his various sayings respecting riches and poverty and the non-resistance of evil. I cannot here discuss this objection as it deserves; but I would briefly point out a consideration of importance, which ought always to be borne in mind in connection with it.

Jesus Christ, born and brought up as a Hebrew of that age, was necessarily under the influences of his training. He naturally partook of the feelings and ideas of his people on many subjects, even as he used the language which they spoke. He nowhere claims exemption from such influences, or assumed to be intellectually infallible, and, beyond question, many subjects of ordinary speculative belief presented themselves to him much as they did to others around him.

But I do not see that this admission affects the value of his great moral and religious utterances, especially those which commend themselves as right and good to our own spiritual nature. At the same time this admission certainly puts upon the disciple the necessity both of care and discrimination in interpreting the words of Christ, and of considering well how far they were addressed specially to those who heard them spoken, how far they are applicable, in any given case, to the altered circumstances and amid the better knowledge of modern life. But, while this is said, the great principles of Love to God and Love to man on which Christ lays his most especial emphasis, and which, as I have before said, are pre-eminent in his teachings, these great principles, with all that they involve for the guidance and the solace of the Christian life, remain ever as the heart and essence of Christian religion; and they are not prejudiced by the accidental and transient ideas on various subjects which formed, as it were, the intellectual outfit or framework of the Teacher's mind. The tone and quality of his spirit are everything, and these are largely independent of the vehicle

Hosted by Google

of thought and language in which they found the chief medium of their expression.

I cannot however dwell on this part of my theme; or on the kindred topic of the imperfect conceptions, in relation to scientific knowledge, which are found in the Bible and which some persons of our time (even eminent and thoughtful men like Mr. Gladstone) would seem to think it imperative upon us to accept as a sort of revelation of Divine truth that may almost supersede and take the place of modern science. Such persons seem to forget that all truth is of God; that the disclosures of science are in fact a revelation of the Creative Mind, and call upon us now to put away the imperfect ideas, the "childish things," of the early ages, of Bible history, the childhood of the world.

But I can only touch these points with this slight allusion to their importance; and I must now go on to speak briefly, in the second place, of another principal part of my subject.

II. I have said that the essential thing in our position is faithful allegiance to Christ alone; and this especially in regard to his own example of faithfulness to Duty and his great central principles of Love to God and Love to man, with all that these, rationally interpreted, must be taken to involve and carry with them.

This brings me to the remark that Christianity, like other widely diffused religions, is closely bound up with this kind of personal allegiance. All the great religions that have moved the world have been formed round a personal centre. And there is good reason for this. In a living person we have no mere abstraction or negation, such as cannot kindle enthusiasm or even unite men together in a common reverence. In a personal leader we have not only provision for historical continuity and an historical name — a consideration of obvious importance in connection with the growth of a religious influence — but we have also something of the affections and sympathies which cluster so naturally round a human life and tend to bind together the disciple and the master. Now, this personal element is richly provided for us in Christ. Allegiance to Him is therefore from this point of view a main factor of our Christian position; as indeed how could we take his name upon us if, at the same time, we put away from us the love and reverence which are due to a venerated leader.

If this be so, then all this implies and requires that we should find in Jesus Christ one to whom we can look as a brother man; a Son of God indeed, by the love which God bestowed upon His chosen servant, but a true Son of Man also by virtue of the inherent powers and capacities of his own nature. A God suffering and dying could be no true leader, and no imitable example, to us frail and tempted mortals; and such a being is wholly inconceivable,— if not even a contradiction in terms. The Christian leader is accordingly set before us, not as God but as man. "The man Christ Jesus" is a New Testament expression, substantially repeated in various forms and in many instances. The God Christ Jesus! this nowhere

Hosted by Google

occurs; nor is the idea of Jesus as God anywhere really to be found in the New Testament. And this proposition too is of the essence of our Christian confession. In illustration of this statement, go back for a moment to the three oldest Gospels: you have nowhere in these any hint that "the prophet Jesus, from Nazareth of Galilee," as he is termed in one place,* Jesus the carpenter's Son, whose brothers and sisters and father and mother were well known to the people around them, you have nowhere, I say, any hint that He was ever thought of in any higher character than as the well-beloved Son, the Christ, the Servant of God. So it is in the book of Acts and throughout the Pauline Epistles, in spite of two or three apparent exceptions, which are only in appearance and will not bear examination.†

The original and primitive idea of Jesus Christ was that of a divinely endowed Man, the chosen servant of God. But the speculations of Grecian converts speedily transformed this idea, and expressed it in a way which gave origin to all the latter development of orthodox Christian theology.‡ This has been recently admitted in very remarkable terms, in the important work of a most thoughtful, eloquent and learned writer, of the Episcopal Church of this country. I allude to Prof. Alexander Allen's *Continuity of Christian Thought* (third edition, 1866). In that work it is clearly stated and it is asserted more than once, and in so many words, that "Christian theology was the fruit of the Greek genius, and had its origin in the Greek city of Alexandria" (p. 33). The same writer speaks of "the divine revelation given in Greek philosophy" (p. 35); and refers with evident approval to an idea of Clement of Alexandria to the effect that Christianity "grew as directly out of Greek philosophy as out of Hebrew prophecy" (p. 39). I could quote other expressions to the same effect; and I must add that I have not elsewhere seen any such frank and undisguised avowal as to the origin of orthodox theology — its origin not from the teaching of Christ or the New Testament, but from the philosophical speculations of certain later persons, converts and others, beginning with Justin Martyr, and coming down to the times of the Nicene Fathers, in whose hands the orthodox system assumed something like its complete form.

And, without doubt, this is a correct account of the subject. The introduction of the doctrine of the Divine Word, the Logos conception, into Christian thought and speculation is the true commencement of orthodox theology. This conception, so far as appears in the New Testament, was entirely unknown to Jesus and his immediate followers; although the idea of the Logos was familiar enough in certain quarters, long before their times, as may be seen in the writings of Philo of Alexandria.

* Matt. xxi., 11.

† I refer to such passages as Rom. ix., 5, and Titus ii., 13, of which see the Revised Version of the New Testament.

‡ By the word "orthodox," is meant that which includes the doctrines of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ as essential principles.

Hosted by Google

The Logos has been defined by Dr. Liddon as "the Thought of God." It is the Thought of God manifesting itself in action, in the Creative Will and Work, as seen in the outward universe. It was said to come forth from God, even as a word comes forth from the mind of man to execute his will. Then, by an easy transition, this divine energy was endowed with personality. The same was in Jesus, and according to the Fourth Gospel it constituted him the Christ; but neither was the Logos itself a separate or second God,* nor did its presence in Jesus make Him a second God. The tendency was, however, constantly to make a personal being of the Logos; and it is not improbable that we have the commencement of this process in the Fourth Gospel. Hence the results at length reached by Nicene orthodoxy, and the later result of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead — a mysterious and impenetrable subject of which the human mind has no real knowledge, respecting which nothing has been revealed to us, and respecting which only the daring intellect of ancient or mediæval speculators could venture to dogmatize.

In the idea of the Apostle Paul, "GOD was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself"; according to Peter, Jesus of Nazareth was "a *man* approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him";† and in the same way Jesus himself in the Gospel uniformly ascribes his "work" to the power of God working in him. "I can of mine own self [he said] do nothing"; "The Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." Such was the primitive conception, as presented to us in the three oldest or more properly historical Gospels — a conception considerably modified in the Fourth Gospel.

In the language of Greek philosophy the same thing was said in other terms; and according to this the Divine Word, the Logos, was in Jesus, "was made flesh" in him: but this was really a way at first of denoting that the divine purpose and power of the One God, the Almighty Father, revealed themselves specially to the world in him. The Father was in Christ by His Logos; but this, as just observed, did not make Christ personally to be God — any more than the gift of the Holy Spirit to a disciple, according to the New Testament statement, was conceived to make that disciple God. The great perversity and blindness of orthodox theology are just in this: it cannot or it will not see that the Logos in Christ was simply the manifestation in him of the will, purpose, and power of the One mysterious and inscrutable Deity. And so, in violation of the fundamental principle of Jewish and Christian monotheism, it insists on making "the man Christ Jesus" into a sort of second God, equal, we are told, to the Almighty Father himself. It brings us thus to the conclusion that the Infinite Being lived upon the earth as an ordinary man; that he went about among the people trying to teach them and bring them to believe on him; and that

* But Philo, it will be remembered, does speak of the Logos as δεύτερος θεός. This was with him probably only a figure of speech.

† Acts ii., 22.

Hosted by Google

he *failed* in this purpose, being at last condemned and put to death as a common malefactor!

Such is the amazing conclusion which the prevailing Christianity sets before its disciples; and all this mainly on the insufficient ground that the Divine Logos is said to have been incarnate in Jesus. But in truth there is no foundation for such statements in a just and historical interpretation of the Logos doctrine, as presented in the Fourth Gospel. For we have ever to remember that the Divine Logos, according to the original idea of it, was incarnate, in a sense, not only in Christ, but in *all* men. It is manifested in the order and beauty of the works of nature; it is present in the reasonings and investigations of science, in the government of the world, in the origin and growth of knowledge, and in the thoughts of wise and good men of every age. In all this it is the same divine energy that is acting, working, ruling, inspiring, and controlling; and although it is said to have been specially in Christ, it is nowhere said to have made him individually God, which indeed would be, and is, a wholly inconceivable and incredible proposition.*

This is, in substance, admitted even by Dr. Liddon, a man of the highest Anglican orthodoxy, who expressly says that "to think of the Logos as an independent being would be an error at issue with the first principle of Christian monotheism"; and yet the writer of these words is in the constant practice of paying the most direct worship of prayer and praise to Jesus Christ — so doing in obedience to the creeds and the liturgy of his own Church, the established Church of England.

Such is the inconsistency of modern orthodoxy, and from this inconsistency it seems to me to be one of the chief functions of the Unitarian body to call back the Christian world; — one of its chief functions, as it would be also its greatest glory, to be an effectual instrument in rendering such a service to the world.

I have not time or space to touch even slightly upon the question either of the authorship or the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. I can only observe that this Gospel is composed in harmony with the Logos conception. Jesus appears in it as the Word incarnate, and he is made by the author to speak and act consistently in that character. But yet this Gospel carefully refrains from making Jesus God. "No man [it tells us] hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" — the only begotten Son, the divine Logos, speaking in Jesus, has revealed the Father to us.†

It is familiar to every one acquainted with this subject that the Logos

* Prof. Allen has the following remarkable words, in his exposition of the teaching of Clement: — "Since Christ is the indwelling God, His incarnation is not a thing new or strange, an abrupt break in the continuity of man's moral history; . . . He was in the world before He came in the flesh. . . . As indwelling Deity, He was to a certain extent already universally incarnated, as the light that lighteth every man, the light shining in the darkness, the light and life of men in every age." (*Continuity*, p. 47.) All this is in harmony with what I have written above respecting the Logos; and would be strictly true if the word Logos were substituted for each of the two words "God" and "Deity" in this quotation.

† Comp. John v., 44; xvii., 3.

Hosted by Google

doctrine was widely known in the world long before the Fourth Gospel was written. It may be found fully developed in the writings of the Jewish Philo, who was an older contemporary of Christ; but, surely, we are not to go to Philo or to other writers of his school, any more than to later Greek Fathers, for our knowledge of the most essential teachings of the Christian Master. This is what the upholders of the popular orthodoxy virtually do; and I venture to say again, it is the great work of the Unitarian section of the church to recall the Christian world to a real allegiance to its great Head; to put aside Nicenism, Athanasianism, Calvinism, Wesleyanism, and go back to the Fountain-head, there to seek and to find in Christ himself, who is the all-sufficient Teacher of his own religion, the unity and peace which are not now possible under any other name.

One word more remains to be said; it is, that the true way, the only way, out of the Trinitarian controversy, is to shew that the doctrine is not to be found in the New Testament books, when these are read and interpreted in the sense in which they were originally written. There is no Trinity in those books, nor is the Godhead of Jesus of Nazareth to be found in them. These things come from other sources; and we have now the clear, full admission to this effect of one of the ablest living adherents of the popular theology.

Again, then, let me say, our Christian position as Unitarians lies simply in this,—that we adhere to Christ as the one true "Leader of our faith and Captain of our salvation"; that we put aside all other names, as unworthy to stand beside his, or to supersede his; that we take Him alone as the Way, the Truth and the Life, for all Christian men.

In the words of one of your own honoured prophets, words which I adopt with a slight alteration to fit them to my purpose in quoting them:

"We look to CHRIST; His truth is still the light
Which guides the nations groping on their way,
Stumbling and falling in disastrous night,
Yet hoping ever for the perfect day.

"Yes, He is still the life; He is the way
The holiest know; light, life and way of heaven;
And they who dearest hope and deepest pray,
Toil by the light, life, way, which He hath given."

Hosted by Google

THE FULNESS OF GOD.

BY REV. SAMUEL R. CALTHROP.

"The fulness of Him that filleth all in all."—EPHESIANS i., 23.

A MAGNIFICENT, an overwhelming conception. God filling all things up with Himself, so that there is no room for anything else! God, who is all in all; God, in whom all atoms, worlds, and beings live and move; God, in whom all space, power, beauty, wisdom, justice, thought, love, and life exist for ever and ever; God, in whom man lives; God, whose space and force surround, interpenetrate, and include the body of man, whose thought and wisdom enlighten the mind of man, whose justice gives law to the conscience of man, whose love rejoices the heart of man, and whose life surrounds, interpenetrates, and includes the life of man,—God is the transcendent theme of our meditation to-day.

The theme being so vast, it will be wise for us to deal with it in detail,—in fragments, so to speak. Let us, then, take up one by one the attributes of God. Seeing only one side of God at a time, as it were, we shall be sheltered, as Moses was, by cleft of rock and shadow of hand from full blaze of the ineffable glory.

Let us then say, first of all, that, since God is all in all,—that is, is strictly infinite,—all the attributes of God are infinite. Each attribute is coextensive with every other attribute. Where any one attribute exists, there every other attribute coexists with it. Where space exists, there power, thought, wisdom, beauty, truth, justice, love, exist: for all these are attributes of God, modes of the being of God.

I. The space of God is infinite, and is coextensive with all the attributes of God

Spinoza, the father of modern Scientific Philosophy, was, as Schleiermacher lovingly called him, "a God-intoxicated man." He saw all things in God. And yet all that most men know, or rather misknow, about him, is that he granted just two attributes to God,—extension and thought. Granted? Why, the man lived in God! To him, God was all in all. What he did say was this: "God, being infinite, lives in infinite modes; and two of these modes are extension and thought." Out of the infinite number of modes, he selected these two, simply because they are not only so closely related to man's own existence, experience, and thought, but also because on these two modes, as foundation, he builds his scheme of the universe.

The mind demands the origin of the visible universe; that is, demands

Hosted by Google

something for that universe to rise out of. But the mind also demands that that something shall itself be unoriginated, as otherwise thought would find no resting-place. Two postulates will forever be essential to any system of thought: 1. Unoriginated Substance; 2. Unoriginated Space. On these as basis, the whole universe can be constructed. If, with Spinoza, we consider space an essential attribute of substance, then Unoriginated Infinite Substance is the one all-sufficient postulate, which being granted the origin of the visible universe is only a question of detail.

Our one postulate, then, is Unoriginated Infinite Substance. In other words, our one postulate is God. This mighty postulate once granted, all things, beings, worlds, are modes of motion of His Spirit. The material universe is fated or uniform motion: the spiritual universe is free or independent motion. In God alone do all things find their true substance.

There are other good reasons why, in our analysis of the attributes of God, we should begin, as Spinoza did, with space. Space is the first attribute of God of which the infant mind becomes conscious. Indeed, we may say it is the one attribute of God of which all organisms are more or less conscious. The reason why the commonest minds know something about space is that they have a vast organic inheritance of space-perceptions behind them. Other organisms have labored, and they have entered into their labors. It is well, therefore, to begin where experience begins.

There are, however, difficulties on the threshold of our examination, which could completely block the way, if they were not got rid of. The first class is the besetment of ordinary minds. There is an absurd notion floating about that space somehow exists of itself, independently of any being whatever. God, therefore, I suppose, in the far past found space conveniently lying round, and wisely made use of it for creative purposes. There must therefore be two independent existences,— God and space; for there would be no room for creation if space did not kindly lend itself to His design. Or, perhaps, the two high contracting parties agreed on equal terms, one to create and the other to find room for creation.

The mere verbal statement of the logical outcome of these vague notions is enough to show their absurdity.

The other class of difficulties besets more thoughtful minds. When a clever man has thought himself into a fog about space, he is apt to imagine himself quite a metaphysician, especially if he can repeat some perfectly unintelligible formula about space.

To quote a familiar unintelligibility, "Space is a form of thought." Now, thought is a mode of motion. Human thought is a mode of motion of the human brain, corresponding to and accompanying a motion of the human spirit. But motion is not a thing: it is a state of a thing. The motion of a snowflake is not the snowflake: it is a state of a snowflake. Therefore, the expression, "Space is a form of thought," is equivalent to this other, "Space is a state of the human brain." If, then, you really mean that Space is a state of the small human brain, whose space-filling

Hosted by Google

cavity is only a few cubic inches, this is not simply absurdity: it is delirium.

If, however, you say, "Space is the form of thought,"— meaning by the form the mould in which all thought is, of necessity, cast,— you have stated a great truth, no longer a piece of metaphysical moonshine.

If, again, you say, "Space is a form of the thought of God," this is no longer an absurdity: it is only a confusing of two coexistent, infinite attributes of God,— extension and thought. God's thought, being infinite, is coextensive with God's space.

So much for these two classes of difficulty. There are signs abroad that they are both steadily diminishing. Ordinary minds are being educated into an awe-struck sense of the immensity of space; and thoughtful minds are becoming weary of the endless treadmill of bad definition, mounted upon which a man can keep on walking upward forever, without rising a single inch.

I had gone thus far, when I was summoned from my desk by a friendly visit from a book-agent. Silver and gold had I none, but what I had I gave. I showed him a grand sun-spot in the telescope. He was evidently deeply impressed, and suddenly burst forth with this: "The one thing that overawes and overwhelms me is the infinity of space! I can't take it in!" When a book-agent is overawed, it is a note of advance all along the line.

But to proceed. Space is the necessary substratum upon which, as foundation, all things stand. As all motion is performed in time, so all existence takes place in space.

Here it is essential to sweep away at once the ten thousand illusions which beset thoughtful minds when they first begin to think about space. We constantly hear such expressions as these: "Thought requires no space, feelings have no space-relations." The act of thought or emotion, we are told, is purely spiritual, meaning by spiritual something that has no space-relations at all. Now, no entity exists that has no space-relations: each and every part of every being is always and everywhere related to space.

Thought in the human body is a wave vibration; and a wave vibration must be of something, and not nothing. No matter whether of brain and nerve, or of something ineffably finer, which corresponds to an archangel's thought as these do to man's thought,—always and everywhere, thought will be a particular state of a being who is wholly immersed in space-relations.

Christianity has always believed in the spiritual body; that is, in the continuance of natural and intelligible space-relations in the life beyond death. If, however, we take for granted the possibility of purely bodiless, finite spirit, that purely bodiless spirit will be as completely immersed in space as rock, plant, animal, or man, will have as perfect space-relations with the All and with each finite thing as if it were a ball of iron. As an example of moonshiny thinking, I take an instance from a really fine

Hosted by Google

modern thinker. "We might as well talk," he says, "of pure spirit being white or black or green as speak of it being either here or there." This is simply idealism gone mad, and it is not too much to say that no scientific metaphysics will ever be possible to minds that have not got rid of these prescientific notions.

In the deepest sense, then, we may say that Space is The All, including within itself all forms of being, all matter, all spirit, and all manifestations of both matter and spirit; and Space, to all alike, is that underlying reality without which none of them would be conceivable.

To the archangel, — that is, to the fully developed man, — Space is the Presence of God, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, in whose fulness are included all power, all beauty, all intelligence, all truth, all tenderness.

This stupendous thought, the greatest that a finite mind can grasp, is just dawning on the mind of man. He has begun to behold the rising light, who sees that there is no such thing as empty space. From this, he can proceed to construct his universe.

The child first learns that the earth is a sphere eight thousand miles thick. The man, all his life long, is busied in filling up this conception, until, at last, each inch of that sphere is seen to be full of power and wonder and beauty. Oceans and continents, mountains and valleys, tropic splendors and icy poles, forests of a thousand woods, flowers of myriad hues, marts and cities and homes of men, steamships ploughing the mighty deep, trains rushing across the continents, wires flashing their electric message, — all the inconceivable variety of human life, — all this he sees on its surface alone; while, beneath his feet, his thought penetrates below the roots of the mountains to that hidden ocean of living fire which eye of man shall never see.

Just so the first lesson for man as a child to learn is that Space is infinite; that he can send his thought onward for ever and ever in every direction, and still find himself in the very centre of things. Developed man is to fill up this skeleton conception with all worlds and beings that are: with galaxy after galaxy filled with light and life; with destinies innumerable in trillions and trillions of planetary homes; with power, justice, wisdom, truth, and love vindicating themselves everywhere, in everything; while through all, above all, around all, and in all shine the light, life, and glory of the One Eternal, in whom are all things and by whom all things consist.

II. The power of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space and with all the other attributes of God.

All space is powerful space. There is no such thing as a power-vacuum. Empty space is an empty phrase. There is no cubic inch of empty space in the whole universe. Take a cubic inch of space midway between the sun and Sirius. Through that cubic inch the light and heat of Sirius pass. Let us analyze the beam by the spectroscope, and see what this means. Commencing at the ultra-red end of the spectrum, let us

Hosted by Google

start with the invisible heat-waves. The longest of these we may call $\frac{1}{30,000}$ of an inch in length; that is, our cubic inch will contain 30,000 such waves. Omitting all delicate gradations of half-waves, quarter-waves, and so on, we will consider the next group to be those waves of which there are 30,001 to the inch, and the next 30,002, and so on. Each group of waves is present in the cubic inch at the self-same instant, and each passes through without the least interference from the other. When we arrive at 40,000 to the inch, we are well inside the visible red; and we must keep adding 40,001, 40,002, etc., to our series of waves. At 50,000 to the inch, we are in the centre of the visible spectrum, and keep on adding, remembering all the while that the yellow and green waves are wholly independent of the red. At 60,000 to the inch, we are in the violet, and keep on adding as before. At 70,000, 80,000, 90,000, 100,000, we obtain wave-lengths in the ultra-violet, invisible chemical waves, each group being completely present in the cubic inch, and each being absolutely independent of all the rest. At last, we have obtained a fair notion of the number of waves which are present in our cubic inch at the self-same instant from Sirius alone; that is, if we considered Sirius to be a simple tiny point of flame instead of being a mighty globe millions of miles in diameter, each square inch of whose surface sends forth a series of such waves. At the same instant there is present in the cubic inch a similar series of waves from every square inch of Arcturus, each wave of which does not interfere in the slightest degree with the waves of Sirius; also, from Vega, Canopus, Regulus, and the six thousand stars visible in a great telescope. Also, from the innumerable planets, whose faint light no telescope is fine enough to catch, a series equal in number to those of Sirius is present at the same instant in that same cubic inch. But how long is that instant? As light travels 190,000 miles in a second, this inconceivable series is changed into an entirely new series twelve billion times a second. Space is empty? But this is only one set of space-relations. Through that inch the gravitating relations of Sirius with the whole universe in a straight line beyond that inch pass; and you must prolong that gravitating line to infinity for Sirius alone. Then a similar line for Arcturus, Vega, and the twenty millions of suns in our galaxy, and the billion planets, and the uncounted nebulæ, and the infinite number of atoms of star-dust. Through that inch, all this passes simultaneously; and at every instant a different line is drawn, as each of these trillions of objects moves on its destined course. Each change in a star quintillions of miles away is instantly, without any time interval whatever, reported in that inch, so that the movement of the whole universe incessantly registers itself inside that inch. If an archangel, after millions of years of study, could thoroughly know what goes on in that inch, we might say that he knew the universe.

The exactness of God is in that inch. Not a single one of these infinite number of results registered itself there wrongly, either as to quality or quantity.

Hosted by Google

The economy of God is in that inch: not one vibration lost; not a single wave that does not produce its full effect; not an ounce of gravitation wasted.

The beauty of God registers itself in that inch. Apply, in imagination, a microscope magnifying trillions of diameters to that inch. Imagine each light-wave illumined, each with its appropriate color; each mingling with every other, with infinite perfection of shape and curve; each running through each, without displacement, confusion, injury, or loss; and, if the watching of the sunlight or moonlight in its play upon the countless waves of lake or ocean be indescribably beautiful, what would such a sight as this be? The beauty of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space.

The love of God is in that inch. To whose eyes do these light-waves bring messages of cheer? To whose heart does day utter speech? To whose mind doth night show knowledge? Who inhabit the worlds that gravitation holds together? In a word, for whose sake is all this done? Out of the infinite number of acts of power that pass through that inch (and, in that inch, we may well say that the whole universe registers itself at each moment), not a single one can be detected which is for the benefit or advantage of God. All, without exception, are acts of bounty to His finite children. The love of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space. The devout mediæval man knelt in awe-struck ecstasy before the throne of God. Around that throne, the archangels stood, rank above rank. Around that throne wheeled the host of suns and stars. From thence, through the realms of space, flew thick and fast the arrows of His will. From thence He ordered all things in heaven and earth; and yet not Saint Bernard himself, in highest rapture of devotion, could conceive, as sitting on that throne, as much power, wisdom, beauty, and benignity as dwells in one single inch of space.

III. The exactness of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space and all the other attributes of God.

The Archangel Mathesis forever stands at the right hand of the throne of God. She claims it, not simply as her right, but as her duty, to calculate all of His wondrous ways that are calculable. Reverently, with folded wings, but firmly, standing on her feet, and looking with undazzled eye into the very blaze of the everlasting glory, on tablets of steel, with pen of adamant, she forecasts the results of the exactness of God. She claims as her own every motion, thrill, and throb of every atom of matter in the universe. She foretells the fated course of the stars. She predicts the result of every heave of the mighty forces imprisoned in the bosoms of all worlds. No quiver of a leaf, no sparkle of a wave, no gleam of color in the tiniest flower, no throb of sunlight, moonlight, starlight, escapes her. Every bone, muscle, nerve, blood corpuscle, every hair-tip, every invisible molecular change in every plant and animal, pays tribute to her. No blush of a maiden's cheek, no thought in a sage's brain, no thrill of inspiration in a prophet's heart, no ecstasy of worship in the rapt saint's inmost

Hosted by Google

soul, can claim complete exemption from her all-pervading scrutiny. She calculates the power of every heart-beat, the exact amount of tissue used up in each single thought, and knows that no life-change, however sublime it be, can ever go on without her. The whole realm of fate is her province; and fate, she knows, is the adamantine base on which all finite freedom must be built. And to man she saith, "Thy wisdom is to know this: on this stone build the house of thy life; for, if it fall upon thee, it will grind thee to powder."

IV. The economy of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space and with all the other attributes of God.

The science of the last hundred years is one long comment on this mighty text. The eighteenth century discovered that matter cannot be destroyed. The nineteenth century has discovered that force cannot be destroyed. The twentieth will discover that mind cannot be destroyed. No single atom of matter in all the starry spaces was ever lost; nay, no atom has ever lost a trillionth part of its potency. No unit of force was ever lost. Unbroken, undiminished, it keeps acting on the universe for ever and ever. In all the starry spaces, no mind was ever lost: it keeps living on in the midst of God forever and ever. To-day we believe, to-morrow we shall know,

> "That nothing walks with aimless feet;
> That not one life shall be destroyed,
> Or cast as rubbish to the void,
> When God hath made the pile complete."

Emerson said that "it must be possible to make such a statement of religion as would make all scepticism ridiculous." We are fast arriving at this. Certainly, we are already able to make a statement concerning infinite space that makes all scepticism about infinite space ridiculous. The proof that power is coextensive with space makes all scepticism about infinite power ridiculous. A similar statement concerning that infinite exactness and economy which are coextensive with space is becoming part of mathematics. Very soon, we shall have a statement of infinite beauty, justice, and love which will equally make all scepticism about them also ridiculous.

In the mean time, never call a man an atheist who believes in and is greatened by one single attribute of God, who is awe-struck with the immensity of space or ravished with the perception of infinite beauty. It is a great thing even to believe that power is, and is a rewarder of those who diligently seek it.

V. The justice of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space and all the other attributes of God.

Michael, the archangel of justice, standing at the right hand of God, with the balances in his left hand and a drawn sword in his right, is the twin brother of Mathesis; for exactness in the material world corresponds

Hosted by Google

to justice in the moral world. That which a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He who sows to the flesh shall to the flesh reap corruption, and he who sows to the spirit shall to the spirit reap life everlasting.

The justice of God is everywhere, and everywhere makes right might, makes wrong weak, makes selfishness stab itself with its own hands.

Daily, the solar system travels through its millions of miles of space; yet no one ever saw one law either alter or grow weak. For the eternal law is equally potent everywhere.

But here comes a deeply needed caution. We are artificially dividing God into attributes.

If you take a red glass, you will see the whole view red. Take a blue glass, and you will see the whole landscape just as well as before. Every tree, hill, and house is in the same relative position: it is simply colored differently. It was red: it is now blue. And so on of all colors.

Now, a red glass is red, just because it lets the red rays through, and stops the others. A blue glass is blue for the same reason. Only when you get a colorless glass — that is, one that lets all the rays through with equal facility — do you see the view as it really is in nature, with its thousand hues of green and blue and gold.

In a precisely similar manner, we may behold the Divine Nature as through glasses of different hues.

If we look at God through the red glass of justice, we shall see infinite space only under the color of justice. Star and system, each vast, each tiny life, will be there, only seen through the monochromatic light of justice. There will still be due proportion to everything, for God's justice is equally present in everything. All space will still be represented, for God's justice is coextensive with God's space. Only, we must carefully bear in mind that we are excluding from our sight the tender shades that are equally present everywhere. We are deliberately making an artificial glare over everything.

But some one may say, But red and yellow, green and blue, are different from each other. Yes; but they are simply different movements of the same element. The immense ocean of ether, which is in all space, is one; and red and green and blue are all waves of that one ocean, differing in breadth and height,— that is all.

Just so we must think of power, justice, wisdom in God, as so many modes or attributes of His one infinite being.

VI. The wisdom of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space and all the other attributes of God.

If an archangel had been given the problem,— "Nothing but God completely filling all space with his presence. From this to show how universes of matter and finite mind can be created,"— the archangel himself would have been baffled.

How to make shore and boundary in the midst of the fathomless deep of God; how to build little local earth homes in the midst of limitless

Hosted by Google

space; how to contrive that somewhere in the eaves of the temple of eternity the sparrow should find a house and the swallow a nest where she might lay her young; how to make material globes out of pure invisible space,— that was the problem; and that problem has been solved.

Wisdom is that which conceives some mighty plan, in order to achieve some great object. The wisdom is shown in the perfect adaptation of the plan to the fulfilment of the object. Make no mistake here. Be sure you are thinking all wrong, if ever you attribute to yourself a power that the great universe has not. You yourself have some capacity to plan, have some power to adapt means to ends. What a surprising little person you would be if the whole galaxy were to stand astonished at the new revelation you made to it: no such thing had ever been seen before! It is true that God's plan in creation has not been understood; and it is sadly true that most men seem to have lavished so much reverence on an unreal plan of creation that they seem to have none left for the real one. The old idea was that God made stars, suns, earths, plants, animals, and men out of nothing, just as they are. This thought has vanished to return no more, but only to give place to the thought of a plan immeasurably vaster, more inconceivably wonderful. You have to conceive that, before ever the atoms were, the thought of God planned out the whole creation; and that, out of His own being, He willed that the innumerable atoms which form the visible universe should proceed, and that each and all, in perfect proportions, should join together to build the mighty whole; and that everything thus planned and created was seen, from the very beginning, to be very good; and that, from that infinitely remote instant, no single atom has ever changed in size or in velocity of interior motion; that the proportions of each, thought out beforehand, have been absolutely kept, and that the result of this inconceivable dance of matter has been, and will forever be, good; and that each combination is the best possible, in order to reach the result aimed at. The thought of oxygen and hydrogen combining to form water is an absolutely perfect thought, and will forever produce good. This is equally true of each one of the immense series. Silicon, nitrogen, and carbon spring from a divinely perfect thought,— a thought that has resulted in divinely perfect action; while each one of their combinations with the other elements, and each of their relations to the perfect whole, are equally perfect. Granted the atoms and their spin, granted the pressure of God's presence everywhere, and you can predict the galaxy. Grant free motion of finite spirit within infinite Spirit, and you have free souls peopling that galaxy.

You are shut up, I say, to the conclusion that, before ever the worlds and atoms were, the thought of God measured size, shape, and velocity of spin of every atom, and also fitted each set of atoms to every other before He made them, unless you are ready to maintain that from all eternity, in a given inch, ten thousand trillions of little, self-existent, eternal oxygen gods found themselves, to their surprise, all exactly alike, and agreed, as it

Hosted by Google

were, to act together; and then, still more to their surprise, became aware that there were in the self-same inch twenty thousand trillions of little, self-existent, eternal hydrogen gods, all exactly like each other, and all precisely fitted to join together with half their number of oxygen gods or goddesses, as the case might be, and so on and so on, to the end of the ridiculous chapter. If you back out and shelter yourself in mystery, and say that the mystery of self-existent atoms is no greater than the mystery of creation, then I answer, One tremendous mystery in one universe is immeasurably more probable than a series of little petty mysteries, whose number could not be put down, if you filled the whole orbit of Neptune with figures so small that you would have to use a microscope to see them.

Forever the atom sings its tiny song in the ears of God,— a song of perfect, infinite content; for it knows that it and its Maker are alike perfect. To all eternity it fulfils His will with absolutely unquestioning obedience. Now floating in the sunlight, now imprisoned in the petal of a flower, now hidden for seeming eternal ages in the darkness of the mine or entombed in the awful splendor of the central fires; now throbbing with the sun's inconceivable heat, now chilled by the bitter cold of inter-stellar space,— always and everywhere, with equal and unchanged joy, it fills its tiny but essential place in the unfathomable creation of God. It cannot "serve Him much"; but it can serve Him forever, and can "please Him perfectly."

> "Would'st thou the highest life know, the 'atom' can whisper its secret.
> What that is without will, that be thou, man, with a will."

VII. The love of God is infinite, and is coextensive with space and all the other attributes of God.

"Tell me a man's ruling love," said Swedenborg, "and I will tell you what he is." Equally true is this, "Give me the sum total of a man's actions, and I will find out from them his ruling love." Let us then judge God by His acts. Whose are the iron and the stone? Whose are the cattle on a thousand hills? For whom do waves sparkle, winds blow, leaves rustle? and for whom does earth pour forth her fruit? Is it for the sake of God that the sun shines, that the moon lights up the night? Has He built the stars for His habitation, and do their light-waves carry messages to Him? Does gravitation keep His house together over His head? What, then, is all this creation for? Whose wants does it meet? Whose intellect does it stimulate? Whose life does it create, protect, and glorify? There is but one inevitable answer. The whole galaxy is built, gravitation pulls, light shines, electricity thrills, and the atoms cohere to form the worlds, simply and solely for the benefit of God's children. The whole cosmos is one mighty token of His love.

It is strange to hear a man like Tyndall speak of what seems the "appalling indifference" of nature to the woes of man, as if nature were one thing and man another, and they existed in two different universes,

Hosted by Google

made by two different beings, for two different purposes, the truth being that this seeming indifference is the crowning triumph of the love divine. It means that in matter God has subjected Himself to man, that in matter God takes upon Himself the form of a servant, that in matter God is absolutely obedient to the dictates of His creatures. Keep the laws of matter, and you can shape it to what moulds you please. Meekly it will undergo all the blows wherewith you fashion it. With fire-beat and hammer-beat, you weld it to your will. In every mighty workshop of the modern day there is many a Jacob who will suddenly awake from his dream and say, "God was in this place, and I knew it not." In matter, man is the master, and God the servant; man proposes, and disposes also. In matter, God abdicates realm after realm of His kingdom, in order that His children may have a kingdom, too. But it is more than this. God has only His own substance out of which to make this kingdom. In matter, God, by a divine act of transubstantiation, forever saith, "Take, eat: this is my body which is given for you!"

But you say, "Now, you yourself are limiting the power of God." Nay: it is God Himself who is limiting His own power.

We do not understand in the least the perfection of God's self-surrender until we know that it is absolute.

God has given His worlds away, and cannot take them back again. He has given to us, His children, real eminent domain over the things He has made.

God has reserved to Himself absolutely nothing of the galaxy. All is now the absolute property of His children. He has only reserved to Himself the right to protect, to guide, to ransom, to rescue, to forgive, the right in all their affliction to be afflicted, the right to comfort and cheer and strengthen, and the right to protect the weak against the strong and to visit the one who wrongs his neighbor.

Jesus did not invent self-sacrifice. He discovered it,— discovered that self-sacrifice is the great central law of the universe, that this is the heart of God. He obeyed it, loved it, lived it, and gave himself for it.

God is love. This is the gospel, the good tidings which proclaim liberty to all captives and comfort all that mourn. It is the good news to all, to the weak as well as to the strong. God is love.

Here is a poor, lonely, forlorn old woman, living all by herself in some crazy attic in a tenement house. Husband, children, friends, are all dead and gone. It is night. The weary toil of the day, too much for the feeble frame, is over at last; and now the one romance of her desolate life begins.

By the light of her one tallow candle, she opens her well-thumbed Bible at the passage which tells of that rest which remaineth for the people of God, of that better, that heavenly country, where her dead are alive to God. Unconsciously, she is trying a great experiment. In this miserable room is there anything besides rickety floor, falling plaster, crazy stove, and single chair and table and empty space around?

Hosted by Google

Yes: there is. She reads on, and the loved faces seem to smile once more upon her, and the loneliness departs; for the love eternal which surrounds her makes her sleep once more in safety.

She dies; and the beloved ones meet her, and lead her toward the great company of "loyal hearts and true," that she may hear the life-song of the redeemed. It fills her soul with joy at first. But very timidly, after a time, she asks if ever she may be possibly allowed to catch a far-off glimpse of that third heaven she has read of, where God Himself is moon and sun. Oh, yes! they will take her at once. Swiftly, they carry her to that blest place. But where is she? Why, she is standing in the old rickety attic. This is the very stove, these the tumble-down walls. Here is each common thing that her past life wearied of so often. But, lo! wall and stove, chair and table, begin to shine, to grow transparent, to become part and parcel of the Love Divine, all love excelling. She has seen God, seen the fulness of Him that filleth all things.

One day, it shall be thus with us all: —

"Soon the whole,
Like a parted scroll,
Shall before my amazed sight uproll,
And then be seen,
In unclouded sheen,
The Presence wherein I have ever been."

Hosted by Google

THE DIVINITY OF MAN.

BY REV. HENRY M. SIMMONS.

IT seems bold to speak of man's divinity to-day. We have lost the story of our special creation in the image and by the hand of God. We have learned, besides, how small our place is in creation,— that human history is but a page to the record of life on earth before it, and the earth but a point to the worlds above it. Deity is greater than even Isaiah told, — weighing in his scales not mere "mountains," but the Milky Way, whose sands are suns, and counting as the "small dust of the balance" not "nations," but constellations wherein our solar system would be as nothing; and to him the stars still sing clearer than in the psalm, "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" But clearer, too, comes the old response,— "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," or, as the revised version reads, "but little lower than God." Whether created in Adam or evolved from amœba, man is here all the same; and, however slowly he has separated from a lower life, he has still crossed a line, and stands in contrast with other animals by qualities no less than godlike. We need not define God; but, taking the attributes which are commonly called divine and are the highest we can conceive, let us think how man embodies them.

I. First is *Power*. And how well man shows this power, not only to control, but to create! Far plainer than in that psalm is his "dominion over beast, fowl, and fish"; for, to-day, he makes fish multiply, and birds and beasts change shape and almost species, and insects even sex, and through the animal world he works with creative touch. Through the vegetable, too, where at his fiat forests grow and flowers take new forms, and Thoreau said he "makes the trees bear fruit God never gave them." He also makes new ground for them to grow in; for, at his order, springs start, and rivers change their course, and even the ocean its shore. "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further," says Jehovah to the sea, in the sacred poem; but it has been proposed to make the sea cover much of the very Palestine where the poem was written; and, long ago, the more difficult deed of driving back the ocean was celebrated in the saying that "God made the world, but the Dutch made Holland." It was not modest in Maupertuis after his polar expedition to figure himself as flattening the earth; but, in many more important places than the poles, man has left his impress on the planet. And on all things in it. He reshapes the rocks, and even manufactures new ones, already shaped for building; changes useless ore to iron, and expects to change clay into more abundant

Hosted by Google

and useful aluminum; turns gravel into glass clearer than nature's crystals, — even makes the crystals so well that, when I asked a girl how to tell true rubies from false, she said by seeing what sort of people they were on. He imitates even organic products,— makes the perfumes of flowers without the flowers, and extracts of fruits without the fruits, and dreams of the day when his chemistry may so control the elements as, perhaps, to compound the fruits without trees, and food without farms. He enslaves all forces, too,— makes the breeze to do his pumping, the brook his sawing and grinding, and the light paint his portrait. He invents new forces,— makes fierce explosives, and gets up earthquakes of his own, by which the rocks are rent, and roads opened under miles of mountains. Even the agents that oppose him he makes to aid him instead, and to avert their own danger. The very river current which forbids him to cross he forces to ferry him over; and the sea, which is raging to sink him, he persuades to float him and his freight around the world; and the winds which blow westward he induces by his sails to carry him eastward instead; and the waves themselves he turns to steam, to carry him faster,— and has a hope that he may yet turn them into fuel. I lately saw a stove burning water instead of wood; and some think the decomposition of water may yet become so easy that we shall use the process, and gather our summer fuel from the showers, and mine our winter coal from the snow-bank at the door.

Or see what man has done with the most fatal of forces. Mr. Quincy tells of the Boston clergyman of 1770 who rebuked Franklin's efforts to protect from lightning, since it was God's agent to punish sin, and must be allowed "full execution." But man has meddled even with this. "Canst thou send lightnings?" said Jehovah to Job; and man to-day replies, "Yes, and make them." He makes them, not in fitful flash, but steady streams, strong enough to kill, or gentle to cure the sick. And he sends them, not from clouds close by to harm, but from continent to continent to help,— to do the old work of months in minutes, and bring the antipodes to our door-steps every morning, and bind the world in better brotherhood. This danger, too, man makes to disarm itself; and in the signal service sends the lightning to warn against lightning, and makes this demon of the storm tell distant cities to prepare for the storm, and put up their shutters and take down their sails,— while it will carry their errands across the ocean and back before a ship could get out of port. So the thunderbolt is turned to all sorts of service,— from lighting the city to drawing the street-cars, from sounding a gong when the burglar comes to making jewelry sparkle,— and is made to work wonders larger than legend ever told or than superstitious credulity could believe. Think of the familiar telephone! The lying Yankee, boasting in England of our superior American achievements, said we no longer used whistles on our railroads, since we travelled so fast that the train would reach the station before the whistle would. But we do far better now, and send the voice without trouble of

Hosted by Google

taking the train, and send a whisper fifty times further than the sound of a steam whistle went, and fifty times faster, too. All these wonders, wrought in a few years, are apparently but the beginning. Mr. Edison, telling the conversation between New York and Cleveland, said, Were a line high enough to avoid loss by induction, we could whisper around the globe, and to the moon, if we had a wire there. And one is sometimes forced to think that we shall yet have something there better than a wire, and find a way of communicating across continents and constellations. It is unwise to boast; but, after what has been done this century, it is hardly safe to say anything is impossible. Said Calonne to the Queen: "If what you want is difficult, it is done. If it is impossible, it shall be done." The proverb says, "The impossible comes to pass." And we have ourselves seen so much of it come to pass, we begin to expect the rest of it will. Robert Browning makes Paracelsus say of man, "See if we cannot beat thy angels yet"; and he certainly has beaten those of Paracelsus's day in his mastery of the earth. He need not feel ashamed if he was made from animal ancestor,— or even from the dust of the ground. He is something very different from either now. Nor need he feel mocked by the immensity of time on earth before him or of space above him. Indeed, geology rather honors him by proving the earth not hastily built in a week, like a squatter's cabin, but with no account of time, like the palace of a prince; and evolution glorifies man by showing what æons of life it took to lay the mere foundations of mind. Besides, man gets all the good of the past. In his coal-beds he harvests the crops of the carboniferous ages, and in his quarries and mines gets the deposits of earlier oceans better than if he had navigated them. The geologist still sails that old Silurian sea more truly than the trilobites did, and knows its mollusks much better than they knew themselves. And, in like manner, the astronomer sails the sky, and traverses infinite space in an instant. Or shall we say he brings the sky to earth? Mohammed failed to make the mountain come, and had to go to it; but man, by his telescope, orders the moon to come, and it comes most of the way; and, by his spectroscope, he makes the sun come all the way, and tell what it is made of, as if he had it in his laboratory; and, by his mathematics, he weighs it, as Isaiah's God did the mountains. The astronomer puts the whole solar system in his scales, and counts the asteroids as the "small dust of the balance." He measures the immensities of space, marks out the paths for planets to follow centuries ahead, and now and then predicts a world he has never seen,— foresees where it must be, and merely takes his glass to get it. The man who can thus comprehend the heavenly movements need not feel mocked by their magnitude. To comprehend meant originally to embrace and include; and mind does include all it comprehends; and the astronomer is greater than any orb or orbit which he can compute. The heavens are indeed high; but man would never have found it out, if he had not been higher. The stars praise not alone their Creator, but the creatures

Hosted by Google

who learn their secrets, and, like Kepler, again think the thoughts of God; and better than in Comte's day the heavens declare the glory *of man.*

But still more does his work beyond physical fields, in ideas and principles. In his philosophy, he goes above the stars and before and after them, to touch abstract and eternal truths. In his poetry, as the word signifies, he again creates,— only an ideal world indeed, but one as real and powerful; for the mere fancies of Shakspere had more influence than all the fleets of Elizabeth. And, in his moral devotion to principles and readiness to die for them, he becomes still greater.

Such *power*, mental and moral, is seen in man. Not, indeed, in all. The masses are far below our picture; and many must be painted in opposite colors,— weak, and wicked, too. Man, as Pascal said, is both the glory and the scandal of the universe. We sometimes see the truth of John Weiss's saying that "it takes a man to be a beast," and I have no quarrel with the doctrine of depravity. But even the weakest and worst men share these high powers in some measure. Besides, human nature is to be measured, not by its worst or even its average, but by its highest form. And seeing in these man's power on earth to control and create, and above the earth to find out and foresee, and, higher still, to live in spiritual principles, we must grant the *Divinity* of human nature.

II. But in our ideal of Divinity is a second element of *Love.* Mere power is oppressive, and even moral principle makes division. But love is a uniter, forgiving defects, harmonizing discords, binding in unity,— hence the holiest of all things, most deserving the name divine. This, too, man embodies. His love begins in but narrow form indeed, between the sexes, uniting only two; but so powerfully that Stephenson, when asked what was the strongest force on earth, replied, "The eye of a woman to the man who loves her."

But love soon extends beyond lovers to their offspring, and unites the family with such force that the Hindu poem said, "A mother's heart outweighs the world." It widens beyond kin, and unites men in close friendships or in some common cause, social or religious. And, in the largest hearts, it overlooks all these dividing lines, and feels that all men are akin, — that the highest cause is that of mankind, and the holiest religion that of kindness. This love is always divine,— uniting lovers, families, friends,— but divinest when largest and working for the unity of all.

Hence, Jesus is rightly revered as divine; for his central word was love. We are apt to forget it; for the Church has concealed him by its creeds, and often reversed his lessons of love, reading his very beatitudes backward, responding to his "Blessed are the peace-makers" by the roar of Christian cannon, and to his "Blessed are the merciful" by the rack, and turning his "heavenly Father" into a fiend who shows his "tender mercy" by the eternal torture of men. But, looking behind the corruptions of the Church and of Scripture, we see in Jesus a living love, harsh only to the harsh, tolerant of everything but intolerance, so gentle in his

Hosted by Google

moral judgments that Renan says he had a "divine *in*capacity of seeing evil," forgiving adulteress, thieves, his own murderers, and carrying his ideas of brotherhood so far as to found a society which, according to Acts, had all its property in common. Perhaps he went too far in this, and was unwise to rebuke rich men with that figure of the needle's eye; though wiser than the Christendom which has so curiously taken that needle out of the way of millionaires, and consigned it to sewing-girls making shirts at thirty cents a dozen, and has allowed Dives to grow to a Vanderbilt and let Lazarus take to dynamite. Jesus' doctrine of brotherhood is wisest, even for states. Gradgrind denounced the pupil who, in her ignorance, said the first principle of political economy was to "do unto others as you would have others do to you"; but she was right, and only the political economy of the golden rule will save society. Brotherhood is the best social bond, sympathy the most religious sentiment. Jesus was right in making love the highest form of good and of God; and, by teaching it and living it, he proved himself Son of God and one with God.

But he taught that love makes all men so. He calls all peace-makers sons of God, and asks that others may be one with God, just as he is; and John says all lovers are: "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us"; for "God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." Love makes all divine.

May I stop one minute to say that this love and unity should be especially sacred to Unitarians, who wear this truth in their title? The theological unity of God may have originally named us; but it included and evolved the profounder truth of his unity *with* mankind, and the more practical truth of their unity with each other. This truth of human unity in God, teaching tolerance of all religious diversities, is the divinest principle Unitarianism has ever stood for or ever can stand for in this quarrelling world, where peace-makers are the truest sons of God. We ought, then, always, first of all, to shun dissensions among ourselves, as our fathers shunned the devil,—which is but another name for dissension. A Unitarianism with the unity left out and division put in would be so false a word and so foolish a thing that I should prefer Presbyterianism. And we ought by the same principle to be ready to unite with honest outsiders, however conservative or radical. We will ever exalt the name of Christ; but remembering how he rebuked those who called him Lord, and worked and prophesied in his name, we shall see that even the name "Christian," however sacred, is not worth quarrelling over. We will not ignore God or cease to worship him; but remembering that God is infinite, "above *all* and through *all*," we shall not feel called in his name to exclude either the orthodox, who sometimes deny him by narrow definitions, or the atheists, who sometimes assert him by refusing to. And, above all, we shall remember that his sacredest name is love,— that God is love, and dwells most in those who love each other, and is worshipped best by working for that human love which always is divine, and makes men so.

Hosted by Google

III. But, in our ideal of divinity, power and love must be followed by a third thought. God is infinite, we say. Is not man also? *Infinity* speaks through his every want and work. Unlike other animals, he cannot be satisfied. Even his lower wants are infinite. What man ever had possessions enough? The millionnaire is always after more. That farmer who wanted all the land adjoining his was typical; and I suppose the most modest man among us would like to own a county, and a country, and, if he had a hemisphere, would want the other, and then a mortgage on the moon, and a few small stars. Who ever had authority enough? The man of Webster's story, who wished the world governed by the United States, and the United States by Massachusetts, and Massachusetts by Boston, and for his humble self only wanted to manage Boston,—sits in your own pew. Our very misery comes not from having too little, but from wanting so much, and is a mark of our majesty. This endless avarice and ambition, so often censured, are only the infinite in us coming out in a cheap way. And it often comes out in a better way. No knowledge satisfies us, but the most learned man feels the least so. No achievement is enough; but Michael Angelo, in age and honor, still claims to be going to school, and Wiertz, half starving, is still said to have refused a fortune for a picture, since he might see how to improve it some time. No moral or religious practice contents. Some, indeed, think they have reached about the end; and Emerson tells of even educated men so "case-hardened against the veracities of the universe" that "neither man nor God can penetrate them." But the live soul cannot stop; and the good gained ever becomes bad, until crowned by a better. Our spiritual powers are infinite, and by use grow with geometrical increase. Love, too, has no limits, but, though a giving instead of a getting, grows by the giving. Says Juliet to Romeo, "The more I give to thee, the more I have," since love is infinite. And power and love not only grow through life, but look across the grave, and ask eternity for increase.

IV. And may they not expect it? Does not man share this last divine attribute of *Immortality?* This is the topic of the next paper, but my subject forces me to give a few words in concluding. It was one of the widest and firmest human faiths, until science made us sceptical, and should not be hastily given up. Even if science denied it, we need not despair; for science is no more infallible than Scripture, and in its progress, as Holmes said of chemistry, is ever "spoiling in our hands." The first steamer that crossed the Atlantic is said to have brought Dr. Lardner's book, which proved, by the surest science, that no steamer ever could cross; and, if scientists should prove that the soul could not cross the ocean of death, it might cross, after all. But they have not proved it, and have said that in the nature of things they never can. All that science has done is to make us doubt what is not demonstrated, and hence doubt the existence of man who can no longer be seen.

Hosted by Google

But, on the other hand, science has itself partly met this objection by asserting an unseen world all about us, more active than the seen. It tells of germs never seen, yet sure of resurrection. It tells that these germs are made of molecules two million times finer than the microscope can find, and these again of elemental atoms fifty times finer still, yet real as rocks. It shows further that things grow active in becoming unseen. The lamenting apostle compares life to a vapor, appearing for a little, and then vanishing away. But vapor proves the most powerful form of matter, and vanishing the signs of vigor. Even gunpowder and dynamite can do nothing till vanishing in vapor; and the cannon-ball is harmless till it gets a gas behind it; and the bottom of the East River is blown out by vapor. Air is vapor and invisible, yet is the breath of life, and builds our forests, and often blows them down like straw. Water must put on utter invisibility in the boiler before it draws the train; and, when decomposed, it becomes still more active. Its oxygen gives force to all the fires; and its hydrogen, the thinnest of our elements, seems the most energetic. We are told that these hydrogen atoms, so fine that a clock ticking seconds for a thousand million years would not count the millionth part of a grain's weight of them, are yet all moving at the average rate of over a mile a second; and some scientists would have us believe further that each atom is a vortex ring revolving eternally. The Persian seer said, "Cleave an atom, and you will find in it a sum"; but our professors find in it something stranger. Or hear them tell of the celestial ether, so much thinner that suns rush through it without resistance, yet a million times as elastic as air,— the nearest to nothing of all we know, yet much the most energetic. Matter seems to grow vigorous by vanishing, and to be most active when on the edge of annihilation. Hence, it teaches us not to be troubled because we cannot see the soul. Force seems to give similar hints. Gravity is unseen, yet shapes suns and their orbits. Light-waves are impalpable, yet weave the world's foliage, and do wider and more wonderful work than the waves of the sea. That electricity plays along our streets all unseen and silent, and bears thoughts which are more intangible, yet shape our lives and set nations in uproar.

So unseen and active a world has science itself found in a few years, and seems to have but begun the discovery, and to be inviting us, with the apostle, to "trust things which are not seen." Our physicists often "walk by faith, and not by sight"; and one who believes in the eternal rotation of vortex atoms ought to find it easier to believe in the duration of human souls. And the truth that things grow active as they slip beyond the reach of sense and of science, tells us not to be disturbed because research cannot follow man after death.

Especially, when we remember that it never found him before death. This human spirit, with its infinite powers and love, is still airier than any atoms, finer than any force, caught by no lenses or logic, eludes physics and metaphysics. Even Tyndall has told us that the connection of body

Hosted by Google

and soul is no more understood to-day than before science began, and that the passage from brain to consciousness is even unthinkable. Nor need the present dependence of spirit on body disturb us. So the seed depends upon the plant, and is produced by it, but leaves it for a larger life; and soul may be as dependent on body, and even a product of brain, and still leave both and live again. Indeed, it sometimes shows a kind of independence now. How often the spirit grows stronger, and shows more power in sickness! How often the mind grows active in sleep, from conscious dreaming to those utterly unconscious states when arguments have been elaborated and written, problems solved, and pictures painted with an excellence unattainable in conscious moments! For consciousness seems but a sort of doorway to the mind, revealing what passes before it, but very little of the vast wealth and work within. Considering this world of unconscious cerebration, or considering merely our conscious thought,— this daily departure from body and earth to traverse infinity and eternity,— one feels that the mind is much more than that quart of mush we call the brain, and might safely move out of it as we out of our own houses. Indeed, death sometimes seems like such a moving; and, in the stories of drowning men seeing the forgotten acts of their lives pass in swift panorama, the soul sometimes seems to be taking down the pictures from its chambers, and stripping the old garret of memory, and bearing all out through the doorway of consciousness to a better abode. Tartini heard his best sonata in sleep; and we may hear a higher music in us, in the deeper sleep of death, when this "muddy vesture of decay" no longer hems us in. Alfred de Musset, speaking of the soul's infinite superiority to a piano of Erard or a violin of Stradivarius, said life might be but the opening bar of the melody or even but the tuning of the instrument.

Certainly, science has no word to say against such thoughts, and by its constant revelation of new wonders seems to invite them. Shall atoms be eternally active,— and intellect that has found them end? Shall impalpable light speed so swiftly and safely through infinite space,— and the mind that measures its speed, and makes it tell its secrets in the spectroscope, be buried with the body? Shall mere breath send its pulsations through the wire, and after fifty miles of silence sound again in speech or music in a far-off city, or stamp itself in the phonograph to sound again in far-off centuries,— and the soul that has wrought these wonders pass to eternal silence? Shall physical force persist forever,— and this love, which was called the strongest force in nature, perish? It would seem wiser to trust that the infinite law, which is everywhere else so true, will take care of this human longing which it has made, and that the creative love which has caused these loves of ours will keep them in eternal safety.

We make no argument, but we cannot ignore these intimations of immortality. Cyrus Field tells of the night when, after his weary search for that long-lost cable two miles deep in mid-ocean, the grapnel caught it,

Hosted by Google

and, trembling with suspense, they drew it to the deck, and, hardly trusting their eyes, crept to feel it and make sure it was there. But when, as they watched, a spark soon came from a finger in England, showing that the line was sound, strong men wept, and rockets rent the midnight darkness; while sweeter still to him was the flash that came announcing the safety of the dear ones he had left by the Hudson. We and our world float like a ship on the mysterious sea of being, in whose abysses the grapnel of science touches no bottom, and can expect to find no solid line of logic connecting us to another land. But now and then there come from convictions stronger than cables, and from love that seems surer than electricity, flashes of light, bidding us trust that those whom death has divided from us are on firmer ground than we, and that these divine souls share also the immortality of God, and are all safe in the arms of infinite law and eternal love.

Hosted by Google

IMMORTALITY AND MODERN THOUGHT.

BY REV. M. J. SAVAGE.

THE wise student will be very cautious in his statements about the primitive man. He has never been seen or studied. What he thought, said, or did, is therefore subject-matter for guessing, but not for knowledge. Scientific faith can resurrect what may be his semblance; but the accuracy of the portrait can always be impeached.

It is said that an Englishman and a Yankee were once discussing the relative antiquity of their respective families. The Englishman declared that he could trace his to a nobleman who came over with the Conqueror, and that there was little doubt that this nobleman's ancestral line ran back to the Cæsars. But the Yankee, with a modesty that occasionally manifests itself in disputes of this kind, quietly remarked that he had at home the genealogical table of his family; and that, somewhere well down the margin, there was a note to the effect that "at about this time the world was created." I suppose that no scholar, to-day, disputes the fact that even the humblest of us can now trace his ancestry so far back that, in comparison with its dim antiquity, the ark of Noah must be looked upon as quite a modern vessel. But, even then, the primitive man, so far from being historical, is not even a tradition or a myth; for even the traditions and myths that gather about the idea of the fancied "beginning" are moulded very largely on the patterns of the times that produced them.

I thus emphasize this point to make clear how ill-founded is any loose talk about the primitive man's thoughts on the subject of a future life. The earliest man of whose thoughts on any subject we possess any reliable information is relatively well on toward the modern age; for an authority like Prof. Marsh, of Yale, tells us that two hundred thousand years is a moderate estimate of the time that has elapsed since the first human consciousness dawned upon what until then had been only an animal world. And, in comparison with this, the Pyramids are of yesterday.

It is doubtless true that there are races of men still alive,— open books for our study,— whose type of thought is older than the hoariest of Egyptian antiquities. But even the slowest on the road have marched on to a point very far this side of the twilight that hides the early morning of the world.

I have made all this very plain, because I regard the statement I am about to make as so very important that I do not wish it weakened by even an appearance of claiming for it more than is really its due. This statement is that a belief in continued personal existence after death seems to

Hosted by Google

be not so much an invention or discovery as it does an original endowment and integral part of man. I say *seems*, because, beyond the farthest point we can reach in our backward investigations, we have only inference as our guide. But, as far back as we can go, we find the belief universal, and bearing even then no traces of being a *parvenu*. Whatever disputes there may be among scholars as to the antiquity or universality of any theistic faith, or anything that can be properly called religion, I think there is no question about this. What I regard as the proof significance of it will be treated later on. At present, I wish only to mark the fact. Man, as we know him, has never seemed able to think of death as a limit to his conscious existence. He has always treated the grave as an incident in his career, not as the end of it. Death, treated as an end, is a modern invention. Who knows but it ought to be regarded and treated as one of the diseases of progress? We have learned a thousand new facts about the universe; and we have built up new theories on the basis of our facts. And, because the facts yet known are not large enough for our human dreams, some wise men are in haste to strangle the dreams. Possibly, it would be quite as wise to wait a little, and see if there are not more facts yet, out of which we may build an addition to our universe, so making it large enough to furnish a home even for so great a thing as a soul.

That we may feel anew how large a part of human life has been that which lies beyond the death limit, I wish to recall to you briefly a few things that you all well know. The very fact that we are accustomed to charge the entire past of human history with excessive other-worldliness only emphasizes the point we have in hand.

Any one who makes a study of the barbaric races will be struck by this, as perhaps the most significant fact about them,— that their whole life is a tyranny, dominated by the spirits of the dead. You may call it a degrading superstition, an over-belief, or what you will; but the fact remains. And it is the fact that now concerns us. In birth and in death, in all that concerns personal, family, or tribal life, it is the dead who rule. Whatever religion there is, is a religion of the dead. Whatever morality exists, the dead ones confirm it or suspend it, as they will. The history of these peoples might appropriately be written under the title of "The Reign of the Dead."

If we pass on to consider the first great civilizations of the world, like that of ancient Egypt, the same striking fact confronts us. It has developed and changed its form; but it remains no less dominant than before. So true is this that the Egyptian hardly began to live before he began to get ready to die. The king fought his battles and sat on his throne by the help of the dead. The monuments that have astonished the world, and so long looked calmly in the face of all-devouring time, are the monuments of the dead. The flowers that, pressed and faded, look, after two and a half thousand years of mummy companionship, as if plucked and laid away last summer, are the tributes to the dead. The literature that remains, lighted

Hosted by Google

with hope of the future, with tender trust in the gods, and tender love for the departed, is *The Book of the Dead.*

The facts concerning the other great Oriental civilizations, of India and China, are so similar to these that I need only instance them thus, and pass them by.

And when we come down to more modern times still, to Greece and Rome, how is it? They had begun, in certain limited ways, to conquer and utilize the forces of this world, so as to make it a somewhat more attractive place for ordinary people to live in. And since, in the popular belief, it was only the gods who inhabited the bright Olympus, and common souls must descend to the somewhat shadowy and intangible regions of the underworld, the future life became relatively less attractive. Achilles, in the *Iliad*, has indeed no doubt of the future state of existence; but the prospect of giving up his powerful physical life here under the blue sky is so little alluring that he declares he would rather serve a keeper of swine here on earth than be the king of all the dead. But, on the other hand, Socrates looks forward with the most delightful anticipation to a meeting and companionship with the heroes of the olden time. Though we cannot now accept the most of his arguments in favor of it, still we must admire his serene faith in the might of his soul to meet and vanquish the universal conqueror. The Greek and the Roman had found no place for a future abode save an underground cavern or some impossible Island of the Blessed. His universe was not yet big enough for a soul that was worth keeping.

The earlier Hebrew thought, so far as the Bible reveals it to us, laid little emphasis on the land beyond the grave. It may well be that the early Hebrew reformers reacted strongly from the excessive other-worldliness of the Egyptian life out of which they had come. They may well have felt that this world and its possibilities had been too much overshadowed by the other. But, as we read even the Bible between the lines, hints of witchcraft and familiar spirits let us into the open secret of the real life of the people. And, peculiar though they were, we know they were not so much unlike their neighbors. While, in later Hebrew thought, the hidden undergrowth of belief and feeling springs up into a luxuriant development that sucks out the life of everything that attempts to rival it. This world and all its belongings become only a sort of proscenium before which, on its little stage, a preparatory piece or prologue is enacted, while the curtain is getting ready to rise on the real drama.

Christianity, at first, was an apocalypse. With its promise of "new heavens and a new earth," so soon to appear in place of the rapidly "dissolving view" of the present order, the things of this life were made to seem as nothing in comparison with the "glory that shall follow." This expected speedy ending of all mundane affairs made not only "afflictions which are but for a moment" seem "light," but it manifestly affected the estimate of great moral and social problems, such as marriage, property, and slavery.

Hosted by Google

All the way down through the Middle Age, purgatory, hell, and heaven were quite as real places in the popular imagination as any provinces or cities laid down on the map. And, even up to the present time, Orthodoxy teaches that this life is only a probation, and that the only real object of it is to get ready to die.

So much review of the past has appeared to me to be necessary, and that for two reasons. First, I wish these facts to be in your minds, to serve as a background against which our modern attitude may stand out more clearly. And, secondly, this attitude of the past will, I think, be seen to possess an important significance in our later discussion.

Leaving the past, however, for a little while, let us now consider some phases of contemporary thought.

The central significance of the Renaissance was nothing less and nothing other than an awaking from a world-trance of other-worldliness, and a discovery of this world. The other life had been everything; and the supposed preparation for it had been by a process of magic, almost or quite wholly apart from any natural connection of cause and effect. Now the worth of this life began to be felt for its own sake. And, further, it began to be believed that the connection between this life and the next was generic, not merely magical; and that therefore the best preparation for the next world might be the making the most and best of this one.

Out of this state of mind, science was born. And the essential spirit of science is the careful investigation of facts and the demand for proof as a condition of belief. It reverses the old idea of "authority for truth," and, instead of it, takes for its motto, "Truth for authority." It thus discovered that much of the ancient and still prevalent belief as to another life was superstition. But many of us to-day need to apply the scientific method to the study of the word "superstition," and so better learn its meaning. We need to learn that labelling a belief "superstition" does not kill it. We even need to learn that proving it to be a superstition is not necessarily proving it to be untrue. A superstition is only an over-belief,—*super-sto*, that which stands over, exceeds,—something that reaches beyond what is at present proved to be true. That which is superstition to-day may be science to-morrow.

This, however, is not saying anything against science. The scientific demand for proof as the basis of all claims to knowledge is simply a demand for common honesty. For he who does not make a distinction between his knowledge and his beliefs or hopes may be very religious, according to popular standards; but he most certainly is not moral.

This scientific demand for verification, then, has enormously contracted the range of our celestial geography. When suddenly asked for the "titles clear to mansions in the skies," either they could not be produced or else the evidence for them was disallowed. And, since the popular belief in a future life could offer for itself no proof that did not seem itself to need proving, there has appeared that tremendous reaction of feeling that takes

Hosted by Google

the name of Agnosticism. It is popular now in some quarters to smile at one who dares even discover the fact that he hopes for immortality, as though he had avowed a family claim to certain "castles in Spain."

Agnosticism commends itself to us by its honesty and its modesty. And it is certainly a blessed ignorance that takes the place of the most that Orthodoxy has been teaching us as absolute knowledge about the future world. Let me adopt Macbeth's creed, that life

> . . . "Is a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing,"—

let us with him walk

> "The way to dusty death."

This were unspeakably better than the old faith. So I have no very hard words for agnosticism as compared with the tyrant it discrowns. But I can no more submit to the new tyrant than to the old. For when it attempts to set limits to investigation, and warns us off even from a rational search for "the undiscovered country," then I rebel. Comte, its first secular high priest, attempted it even in regard to an investigation of the physical heavens; and hardly was he dead before the spectroscope turned his wisdom into folly. Who knows but some spiritual spectroscope may play the same havoc with the wise ignorance of agnosticism concerning the spiritual stars of which the world has always been thinking it caught at least occasional glimpses?

The enormous growth of modern science, and the resulting spirit of agnosticism,— these have largely determined the attitude of mind toward this subject of the great mass of the cultured and the semi-cultured people of Europe and America.

But this growth of science, grand as it is, at present is manifestly one-sided and incomplete. We have mapped the most of the earth, and gained a partial control of some of its forces: we have made extraordinary excursions into the heavens, and measured the distances of some of the stars; but man is as yet very largely an unknown country. Even many of the primary problems still wait for solution. Tyndall confesses that "the problem of the connection of body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the pre-scientific ages" (*Fragments of Science*, p. 120). And how much we may not know as yet of the universe about us is hinted at most remarkably by no less a man than Jevons. He says (*Principles of Science*, p. 516), "We cannot deny even the strange suggestion of Young, that there may be independent worlds, some possibly existing in different parts of space, but others, perhaps, pervading each other unseen and unknown in the same space."

Many have been inclined to give up the soul because they could not find it with the dissecting knife. And others have given it up because our ordinary conceptions of space and matter have furnished for it, to the

Hosted by Google

imagination, no appropriate home. But both these positions are utterly unscientific,— a leaping to conclusions before all the evidence is in. And this haste to settle one's opinions is always an evidence of an uneducated or only partially educated mind. Homer had no universe grand enough to furnish a worthy immortality; and so his Achilles looks upon it as a calamity. The world of modern science is not grand enough yet to make room for an immortal soul; and so the belief faints for lack of room to expand and air to breathe. Possibly, some future age may treat both ancient Greece and the present time as illustrations of the necessary failure of men who try to build before sufficient materials are gathered.

Then one of the diseases of our present civilization — a necessary result of an accumulation of facts and material development so rapid that we have not yet been able to master and use them from the stand-point of our higher manhood — is a sort of world-weariness that makes many people question as to whether they want any future life. The present life, with its worry and bustle and confusion, has been too much for them. They are weary, and only want to rest. They confuse life with its unpleasant conditions, and so are willing to be rid of both together.

I only mark this now in glancing at some of the more important phases of the attitude toward this subject of the modern world. And now let us turn sharply round and look in the other direction. Contemporary with this growth of science and agnosticism are the enormous native development of Spiritualism and the sweeping invasion from our old Aryan home of that strange-looking exotic, Theosophy. Science comes out of its inner temple, and by the mouth of its more forward spokesman announces to the waiting world its verdict, "*Agnosco.*" And, representative of many other philosophic authorities, one of our own sages utters the oracular stone for bread, "No wise man will trouble himself about the matter." But, reasonable or unreasonable, the toiling, struggling, dying, but still hopeful masses refuse to look on nonenity as a desirable acquisition. So their answer to science and philosophy is Spiritualism and Theosophy. In vain do the wise men shout, "Atavism," and talk about a reversion of the civilized world to the animistic superstitions of our barbaric ancestors. The loving, hungry human heart still wails its protest in such lines as those of Holmes: —

> "Is this the whole sad story of creation,
> Told by its breathing myriads o'er and o'er,—
> One glimpse of day, then black annihilation,
> A sunlit passage to a sunless shore?
>
> "Give back our faith, ye mystery-solving lynxes;
> Robe us once more in heaven-aspiring creeds!
> Better was dreaming Egypt with her sphinxes,
> The stony convent with its cross and beads!"

These last two lines I, for one, cannot accept. Better "black annihilation" than endless heaven at the price of endless hell. Neither am I

Hosted by Google

willing to have my faith given back to me as a charity loaf, conceded to me on account of a supposed unreasonable heart-hunger that defies the logic of the head. If the temple that is offered me be not large enough for both my faith and my brains, I will still stay in the wilderness and worship in tents, looking for a glimpse of some "better country."

We are now ready to raise the question as to the present standing of this problem.

I cannot say, "Amen," to those who declare that the logical outcome of unbelief is suicide,— that, if there be no future, then this life is not worth having. I cannot undertake to answer for others: but, as for myself, the vision of the blue dome above us, of the wide night sky of stars, of green fields with trees, of cloud-kissing mountains, of wind-swept seas; the love of wife and child and friend; the spectacle of the world's activities, with the glimpses that may be gained of the upward march of humanity along the pathway of the past; the comedy, tragedy, heroism,— all this is so wonderful, so fascinating to me, that I am glad every day that I may have even a brief look at so marvellous a scene. However it ends or when, I am grateful that I was invited to be even a humble spectator.

I say this, not because I imagine that my personal feeling can be important to you, but because I wish my argument to be freed in your minds from any suspicion of being unduly biassed by a personal longing for immortality. I do wish it. But I wish still more not to be deceived. Whatever the fact, I desire to know it, that I may adjust myself to the reality of my position. A prejudice either for or against a fact is something I cannot understand. Let us try, then, with eyes open all around, to see how the matter stands.

In the first place, then, traditional Orthodoxy has nothing to say to any one who needs to have anything said. What it offers in the way of proof is sadly in need of being proved itself. Church tradition is authority only to those who have not investigated it. Biblical infallibility is a thing of the past. The reappearance of Jesus after death may still be accepted by either one of two classes: first, by those who accept it on authority as a dogma; and, secondly, by those who hold that similar reappearances take place to-day. In the first case, it is not evidence; and, in the second, it is believed on account of a supposed present fact instead of its serving as proof of this fact. The Church, then, is, for the present, out of court as a witness.

The transcendental "I know," "I feel," that seems to be satisfactory to so many easy-going liberals,— this also is utterly lacking in probative force to any mind that stands in need of proof. How can a present consciousness testify to the continuance of personal identity into an indefinite future? It seems to me that this talk of knowledge on such a basis is simply a misuse of words. And the somewhat high and mighty air of some who speak slightingly of the asserted low and materialistic tone of those who seek for evidence, and who talk of their personal consciousness

Hosted by Google

of immortality as though it were a sort of saint's aureole that spontaneously encircled the heads of the spiritually-minded, appear to me to gain little in the way of certainty to offset their loss in the way of humility.

Turning now from these negatives, let us see what we can find that leans at least toward the positive.

With only such exceptions as prove the rule, the statement may be broadly made that the desire for continued existence is a universal one. When people tell me that they do not desire a future life, I feel practically certain that the conditions of their life here are such that they shrink from their indefinite continuance; and, not being able to conceive themselves as freed from these hampering conditions, they are conscious of only a longing for rest. And yet it seems clear to me that it is not life they would be delivered from, but only a certain kind of life. The often quoted words of Tennyson, I believe, sink their plummet down to the bottom of deepest truth: —

> "Whatever crazy sorrow saith,
> No life that breathes with human breath
> Has ever truly longed for death."

And, when Mr. Frederic Harrison tells me that I am selfish to wish for immortality, that the desire is an immoral one, it is sufficient to reply that he is selfish and immoral to desire to be alive to-morrow or this afternoon. At any rate, it is only the difference of my wanting a somewhat larger slice off the same loaf. Or when Dr. Maudsley writes,— I quote from a private letter to me; but, as they are his well-known opinions, I am letting out no secret,— "To me, it always seems something of a marvel that any one, looking back on what men have actually been from the beginning, and around upon what they are now, not abstractly, but actually, in their daily doings and being, should think the universe would gain anything by securing their immortality, or need feel itself under any sort of obligation to perpetuate them forever. An eternal Bushman, for example, or an eternal New York Fifth Avenue millionnaire! An eternal chimpanzee were a less ill use to make eternally of the matter of either of them, surely!" — when, I say, Dr. Maudsley writes me like this, I cannot help thinking the Doctor forgets that, if the Bushman and the millionnaire are souls, there may be reason to look upon them as seeds of something better to which they may grow before eternity is quite exhausted. And, when any one informs me that I am only "a worm of the dust," with no right to aspire to such a destiny, I reply that this is just the point in dispute, and that I will accept any lineage, whatever it be, when it is established.

The practical universality of human belief in immortality in all the past has already been made plain. It is still taken for granted by the world's millions. The poets who coin the common heart's sorrows and hopes into song still chant it. The wide-spread reactions toward the older faiths have here their main motive. And the springing up of Spiritualism and Theosophy on grounds burnt over by the fires of the orthodox hell, and

Hosted by Google

right in the teeth of the east winds that blow from the cheerless seas of doubt, testify to the hunger of men for some assurance that the loved and departed are not also the lost.

I wish now to hint at what seems to me the proof significance of this simple fact.

Death certainly seems to be the end, the utter dissolution and destruction of the individual. And, by as much as this appearance seems conclusive, by so much does the wonder grow that anybody should ever have thought otherwise. To talk of shadow and trance and dream is entirely beside the point. It is the paradoxical fact itself, and not the inadequate attempts to explain it, that is the object of our wonder. Familiarity with it has blunted the edge of the marvel. Suppose a dog should be found pondering Hamlet's soliloquy, or bent in earnest thought above the motionless body of one of his companions and raising the question, if a dog die, shall he live again? And yet, if the problem has no more relevancy to the case of man than to that of any other animal, why should it ever have become a problem in the one case more than in the other?

On any theory conceivable, this story of immortal hope is a tale that the universe has whispered to the trusting heart of man. He stands related to the universe as the coin is related to the die. Whatever is in him was first in it. Even the most transient and passing characteristics stand vitally related to external facts that produced them. Nothing comes from nothing. And any characteristic of man that has existed always and everywhere must, it seems to me, be regarded as matching a permanent reality in the universe itself. The basis of all science, the uniformity of natural law, has for itself no surer foundation than this. Indeed, this is its foundation. I cannot see, therefore, why we are not justified, on the clearest scientific grounds, in claiming that this story, which the universe has always been telling to man (no matter through what symbols or by what methods), is an echo of some reality that is a part of the universe itself.

And then, again, it may be said that, so long as the most materialistic science utterly fails to prove the negative, no one can declare the grandest trust to be unreasonable. This faith, so natural to the human heart, is in possession of the ground. It will vacate when the proper warrant is produced. But, until it is, no one need apologize for his faith. So far as any science knows to the contrary, there may be, within each of us, a psychical body that death only releases into an immediate and larger activity; and the inter-stellar spaces may be the scene of intelligent activity so real and intense that life here would appear by comparison only as its shadow. And these bodies and these worlds need not be thought of as unimaginable and intangible spirit, either. They may be as material as the ether, and yet invisible and intangible to our present senses. And, if there be an immortal life at all, I believe we shall be no "unembodied thoughts," but as material as we are now, only in some higher and finer way.

If any one should say that, after having declared my conviction that

Hosted by Google

materialism is dead, I now turn round and accept a theory of the immortal life that is essentially materialistic, I should reply, First, I do not yet *accept* any theory; and, secondly, this conception of future possibilities at which I hint has nothing whatever in common with what is both popularly and philosophically meant by materialism. Such an objection would only be a catching at the word and missing the substance.

Materialism has broken down. It is already an antiquated phase of science. Even Clifford, with his "mind-stuff," and Haeckel, with his "molecular souls," are confessions that they need something besides "dead matter" — which, by the way, does not exist — to explain even the lower forms of life. And, in presence of the higher problems, of thought and consciousness, materialism is as dumb as the Egyptian sphinx.

But, supposing immortal life to be a fact, is there any prospect of its ever being discovered and verified as a reality? No less an authority than Mr. John Fiske says (*Destiny of Man*, p. 111), "Scientifically speaking, there is not a particle of evidence for either view," — that is, either for or against Immortality. And he goes on to speak of desisting "from the futile attempt to introduce scientific demonstration into a region which confessedly transcends human experience." At the same time, he thinks (and he evidently includes himself in the statement) that men will go on believing it as they have in the past.

I confess it seems to me no little surprising to hear a man like Mr. Fiske talking in this way. I find myself almost universally in accord with him; but, in this case, he seems to me to have forgotten his stand-point as a scientific man. Does the problem of immortality "transcend human experience"? Is not this most unscientific assumption of the negative of the very point in dispute? If, in reality, any man has ever entered into an immortal life, then since this man was and is human, the fact of living beyond death is, in this case, a fact of human experience, and so in no wise transcends it. And, if he could come and enter into relations with us once more, then this converse with an immortal would be as much a part of human experience as any commonplace dialogue with one's next-door neighbor.

Now, I suppose that neither Mr. Fiske nor any one else would feel himself warranted in saying that, if there be immortals, this supposition of possible relations with them would be antecedently or inherently impossible. Neither would it require any one to believe in the supernatural; for such converse, if real, would be as natural a fact as any other. Whether, then, this problem be one that "transcends human experience" is a question that no man has any right, scientific or otherwise, to settle except on the basis of the facts and the evidence.

If immortality be a fact at all, and if it be a fact that touches and concerns us in any way, then most certainly it may come within the range of human experience. It is outside that range no more than this continent was before Columbus sailed. And we know now that even this had been

Hosted by Google

discovered, in ways that never became fruitful to civilization, by sporadic and scattered adventurers, over and over again. So, it is claimed, have the mysterious seas of death been crossed over and over again. We now dismiss these stories as idle tales, just as, for many years, the voyages of Marco Polo were looked upon as romantic inventions. If, however, this pathway through the mystery should ever be brought under control, charted, and made into a navigable way, then we should read the old-time stories in a different spirit. The uncertainty, the intermittency, the apparent lawlessness, of these manifestations in the past, is no more against the possibility of reducing them to law and order and knowledge, and so bringing them under voluntary control, than were the first manifestations of steam, electricity, and magnetism arguments in discredit of the locomotive, the telegraph, and the mariner's compass. Whatever be the facts, the mind of man, by the guidance of the scientific method, is as competent to deal with the one case as it has proved itself to be with the others. While the subject itself is as much more dignified and important than these as life is more important than the passing incidents of a day. I therefore protest, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, against both the shallow and flippant scientific disdain of this question, and the airy, aristocratic dilettante indifference with which theologians treat it, while all the time they glare with holy horror at any man who presumes to doubt what they are so ready to admit is outside the limits of proof.

It is sometimes said that, if there be anything in the popular claims of communication with those we call the dead, or if immortality is capable of being proved as a fact of science, it ought to have been known long ago; and that the fact of the lateness of the claim in human experience is much against it. But I fail to see the force of this objection, either from the stand-point of human history or of divine providence.

In the first place, it is claimed — among all peoples — that these whispers from the other side have been heard in all ages from the very first. But, even though all these claims be disallowed,— as they ought to be until established,— it can still be said that there has been no more absolute need of certainty on this point than on many others. And a parallel question might be asked concerning many other discoveries, the knowledge of which has contributed so greatly to the growth of civilization. If God be, and if he loves us, why did he not tell us a thousand things that we, as matter of fact, have been left to find out?

Thus, in human growth, things have their natural advent,— they come "in the fulness of time." First, man is animal; then comes the further evolution of mind; then the moral becomes dominant. May it not well be that the spiritual should appear as the blossom and crown of all? This, at any rate, is Paul's order of progress.

I shall now venture to set my feet, for at least a little way, within the borders of a country that has been at least very rarely traversed on an occasion like this,— the regions of Psychic Research.

Hosted by Google

Some of you must be more or less familiar with the work of the English Society. I have been a member of the American Society from the first, and much of the time chairman of one of its committees. Besides this, I have done what I could as an original investigator for eight or ten years. I think I may therefore claim, without any breach of modesty, to know something more of the subject than those who have given no careful attention to it whatever. Many dismiss it on *a priori* grounds; many others have made up their minds on the basis of one or two public and palpably fraudulent séances; while others know only what, from time to time, they see in the newspapers. It is evident that these people have no right to hold an opinion, much less to express it. And yet, if your experience is like mine, you will find that they are more certain about it than anybody else, and quite ready with their shallow judgment as to the folly of anybody who has really taken the trouble to study the matter.

I have long felt it to be a part of my duty to investigate the subject, and to have at least a few facts, for or against, on which to base an opinion. Some millions of people in Europe and America are Spiritualists, on the basis of what they claim to be personal experience. The belief seems to me to be either the most lamentable delusion or the grandest truth in the world. Which? It really would seem to be worth while to find out, if for no other reason than to deliver the thousands that may be led astray by a fancy. When my parishioners come to me in sorrow and beg for guidance, I feel that I ought to have something for them better than a prejudice.

If a future life can be demonstrated, if communication between that world and this be a possibility, I should most certainly be glad. I do not see how it would change the lines of my regular work. It would only put beneath my feet a certainty where now is but a hope.

I have no time to go deeply into this phase of the subject, even if it were advisable to-day. To treat it at all adequately would require at least an essay by itself. In what I do say, beyond what is accepted by competent scientific investigators, I shall confine myself to the results of my own personal experience, and to briefest hints even here.

Three things I now regard as settled. They do not at all prove the claim of Spiritualism; but they do go a wonderful way in at least illustrating the power of the soul to transcend ordinary physical limits, and act through other than the recognized channels of communication. It is said that one day Theodore Parker and Ralph Waldo Emerson were taking a walk together in Concord, when a wild-eyed Second Adventist rushed up to them with the news — "important, if true" — that the world was about coming to an end. After Mr. Parker had replied that the message did not concern him, as he lived in Boston, Mr. Emerson quietly remarked, "Well, suppose it is: I think I can get along without it." In the light of already established facts, it begins to look as though the soul might, with some degree of confidence, quote the reply of Mr. Emerson. What are these facts?

Hosted by Google

First, hypnotism or mesmerism. This, which a French scientific commission once scouted, after what it called an investigation, is now recognized by the medical fraternity — in the words of one of them — as having "a distinct therapeutic value." I have known a case of a young lady's being put into the mesmeric sleep and having a serious surgical operation performed with as complete unconsciousness as though under the influence of ether. All the ordinary phenomena I have witnessed in private over and over again.

Secondly, the fact of clairvoyance is established beyond question. Under certain, as yet little understood, conditions, both seeing and hearing are possible apart from the ordinary use of eye or ear or ethereal vibrations. What is it then that sees and hears?

Thirdly, it is a fact that mind may impress mind, and, in some exceptional cases, far away, even half way round the world.

Now, no one of these facts, nor all of them combined, goes far enough to prove the central claim of modern Spiritualism. But this apparent semi-independence of the body does at least make the question a rational one as to whether the soul is not an entity capable of getting along without the present physical body. And, while we are on the borderland of stupendous facts like these, I confess I find it hard to be patient with the conceited and flippant ignorance that waives them aside with a supercilious air, while it gravely potters over a fish's fin or a dug-up vertebra of the tail of some extinct mastodon, calling one science and the other only superstition.

Connected with modern Spiritualism there is, beyond question, an immense amount of deliberate fraud. Many people have found that they can get a living in this way easier than by working for it. Then there is much of honest self-delusion, much honest misinterpretation of facts. Certain mysterious things do occur; and they are straightway supposed to mean what they may not mean at all. But all the bad logic of the world is not to be found here. It sometimes gets out of the séance room, and climbs even into the chair of the philosophic or scientific professor. So let us not be too severe on the bad logic of those who have had no special training.

But when all the fraud, all the delusion, all the misinterpretation, have been brushed one side, there remains a respectable — nay, even a striking and startling — body of fact that as yet has no place in our recognized theories of the world and of man. Whatever their explanation, they are at least worth explaining. And, whether they prove or disprove Spiritualism, they cannot fail to throw important light on many problems touching the nature of man. The so-called explanations that I have seen, such as those of Drs. Beard and Carpenter and those of many others, are so inadequate to account for facts of my own experience that, by natural reaction, they almost incline one to grasp the opinions they combat, for the sake of having something a little more solid to hold by.

That physical objects are sometimes moved in a way that no muscular

Hosted by Google

pressure, conscious or unconscious, can account for, I know. That information is sometimes imparted that was never in the possession of either of the sitters I also know. It is true that these cases, in my own experience, are not yet common enough to preclude the possibility of their being accidentally correct; though the circumstances have been such as to make me regard this as a strained and improbable explanation. To have information given me that it was impossible the medium could know, this has been a very common experience. To call it mind-reading is easy; but what is mind-reading? One insoluble mystery is hardly a satisfactory explanation for another. Automatic writing, when the medium was unconscious of what she was writing, and this of a most remarkable character, is another common experience. These are little facts, you may say. But so was the fact that a piece of amber, under certain circumstances, would attract a straw. Science knows no little facts; and any fact, until it is explained, must be either a constant challenge or a standing reproach to any science worthy of the name.

I have never paid the slightest attention to anything that occurred in the dark, or under conditions where deception as to fact was even possible. I have seen a plenty of these, but have always ruled them out of court. And, besides, most of the things that have impressed me have occurred when the medium was a personal friend, and not a "professional" at all.

I must let these bare statements stand as hints only of a story it would take me hours to tell. As the result of all this, am I a Spiritualist? No. Would I like to be one? I would like to be able to demonstrate the fact of continued existence, and the possibility of opening communication between the two worlds. But I am a good deal more anxious for the truth than I am to believe either one way or the other.

If not in the present age, then in some more fortunate one, I believe the question both can and will be settled. And I cannot understand how any one should treat the matter as of slight importance. Thoreau's remark, "One world at a time," has often been quoted as being the end of all wisdom on the subject. But I cannot so regard it. I do not think, as some do, that morality is dependent on it. But I do think that one's belief here may so change his life emphasis as to put a new meaning into his whole career. If I know I am to die in two years, I shall certainly lay my life out on a different scale from that which would be appropriate if I could confidently look forward to forty years more of life; and, in spite of George Eliot's "Choir Invisible," it seems to me that the enthusiasm which works only for a certain indefinite future here on earth, while all the time it is believed that the whole thing is finally to end in smoke, is, to say the least, a little forced and unnatural. And, among common people, not sublimely unselfish, it will not be strange if they care more for present satisfaction than they do for some unimaginable benefit to some unknown people, that, perhaps, is to be attained in a thousand years.

But, if all men could know that death is only an incident, and that

Hosted by Google

life is to continue, for good or ill, right on; and if they could know that, under the working of the law of cause and effect, they are making that future life day by day; that its condition is to be determined thus, not by creed or belief, or ritual or worship, as such, but by character,— is it not plain that this would become the mightiest of all possible motives? If it can be attained, here is a power able to lift and transform the world.

It is not a question, then, that is all in the air, and is of no practical importance. I know of none that I believe to be more practical.

But, if this certainty is never to be attained, I believe with Mr. Fiske in this,— that the great majority of men and women will still cherish the hope, at any rate in hours of sorrow and loss. In the glare of day, when they are prosperous, while the sun shines, they may forget it or doubt it; but, when the night comes, they will look up at the stars, and dream at least of other and happier worlds. And this, at any rate, can be said for the dream: that no advance of knowledge as yet has proved its right to impeach it, or take away its comfort from the hearts that ache for the sight of faces that have vanished.

Hosted by Google

THE NEW ETHICS AND THE NEW PIETY.

BY REV. CHARLES F. DOLE.

If that is new in the world which only a few scattered pioneers have ever put into practice, which has never even been understood by mankind at large; if that may be called new which is sharply contrasted with all that is mostly in vogue; if an idea is new whose first traces only run back a few centuries, while the old habits which the new proposes to alter have swayed men for unnumbered thousands of years; if that is new which is destined to rule the future as universally as the old has ruled the past,— then we may say — the new ethics.

The distinction between the new ethics and the old is as simple and radical as between the old Ptolemaic astronomy and the Copernican. It concerns the point of view or centre from which man looks and acts. The old ethics took the individual man as its centre. So far as the individual asked, Why must I do right? the answer concerned his *personal* interests. You must keep the commandments, honor parents, do no violence, lest violence be done in turn to you, to have long life, to secure prosperity. This has been the prevalent ethics of mankind as far back as history goes. This is the ethics chiefly in vogue everywhere. It lets men in business push and snatch and compete to get the most from each other. It lets them serve themselves first in politics, and the State afterward. It divides people into self-complacent sets and cliques, on the false lines of pride and money. It finds plausible excuse for self-indulgence. It has a different standard for the woman and the man. It always asks of every change or reform, Is the thing safe and expedient? not Is it right?

The new ethics is not a new set of rules of conduct somewhat more strict. It is the recognition of a new centre for each man's moral astronomy. Instead of the individual's personal interests and pleasures, the test question is, What does the brotherhood of humanity need? This applies to every department of life,— business, society, politics, amusements. How shall we treat each other as friends? What will develop manhood? The new ethics points to the mournful spectacle of selfish individualism, in millions of phases, toiling in vain through uncounted barbarous ages down to the present. Selfish individualism never yet worked out a beautiful, blessed, or happy life, but failed, as the lower brute thing has to fail before the coming of the new and higher era of growth. It never more signally failed than to-day. It never failed more flagrantly than when it has held power, rank, means, culture in its hands, helpless, in spite of them all, to satisfy the hungry soul of man.

Hosted by Google

The new ethics does not, as some suppose, disregard the individual and his personal rights. On the contrary, it grasps the eternal fact which the good emperor long ago saw, that "what is good for the swarm, that only is good for the bee." Let the life of the brotherhood be made rich, and the individual shall participate. Let each devote all that he has for the sake of the whole, and the wonderful law shall prove true that "he who will lose his life shall save it."

It is a real and profound conversion, when a man, renouncing the old centre of morals, ceases to ask what he must do to save himself, to get personal culture or happiness, and, fixing his choice on the new centre, henceforward asks, How much can I do to lift, save, and help the brotherhood? Having before hesitated to do what was right till it could be made comfortable and easy, he is straightway seized with the greater zeal to take his place in the advance guards, and even the forlorn hopes of mankind, to accomplish the ideal things which men call most impracticable. Fear and favor, personal rewards and punishments, disappear from the view of him who changes the moral centre. His fear is for what his weary, toiling brothers suffer, doing evil rather than good, losing the way of life. A love broad and deep moves him. Whatever is human becomes his interest, his solicitude, his glad responsibility. It is a new moral life, wherein old things have passed away, as with a new heaven and a new earth.

Thus, the new ethics explains the dim sense of a constraining *ought*, like a life instinct of the race, that was always binding man to do what he did not choose, and what he could not foresee would benefit the individual at all. It was "a power, not himself, making for righteousness." Brought fully to consciousness and summed up into one sentence, the new ethics means *a definite committal of one's self to treat every one else as a friend and brother.*

There was a self-regardful type of piety that corresponded to the old and self-regardful ethics. From the point of view of the individual, there was a peculiar, narrow, and distorted outlook upon the world, the mystery of being, and the unseen power that orders life. The universe seemed to be full of haunting dangers that oppressed men and needed to be propitiated. Or the unseen One became a personal friend, who cared for the chosen man and his tribe or race, but hated others. The rites and forms of religion took color from this narrow outlook, this personal relation that held between the Deity and the individual. It was as if, even in his religious moods, a man dared to say, "God and I." Man's astounding egotism expected ambitions to be gratified, rains to be sent, sickness cured, death deferred, at the prayer of God's friend. Man's egotism, soaring higher, thought to have paradise for himself and the few of God's favorites who agreed with him, while the rest of mankind should be doomed to ruin. Thus, piety took on its necessary tone from the point of view where men habitually lived. Men thronged temples and churches for what each could get or to escape the dreaded penalties of impiety. Men said, "For Christ's

Hosted by Google

sake," as a sort of talisman to hide their real meaning, "For my sake." They sang *Te Deums*, and went away feeling safer. In higher phases, they asked for "the peace which passeth understanding," as though religion were only a more refined form of selfish enjoyment.

You cannot obey law, however superficially, and quite fail of its beneficent consequences. The old ethics, albeit self-regardful and obeying law under fear, yet tended to produce a certain type of character, upright, just, pure, conscientious, charitable. This was the type of the Pharisees at their best. So the old piety, while narrow, could at its highest be devout, reverent, and trustful. The old ethics and piety were provisional. They were always reaching up toward something larger and more adequate. They presented ideals altogether at variance with the self-regardful plane of life on which men started. While churches explained away the Sermon on the Mount, and adopted substantially the self-regardful ethics of the world, thousands of isolated lives, as if by a divine inspiration, struggled to show forth the beauty of the new ethics of human sympathy in the midst of multitudes who called them unpractical and visionary, and did not dare or were not willing to catch their spirit. Who does not owe grateful memories to true and self-forgetful souls, who somehow flashed upon our minds a sense that duty and religion were altogether holier and more gladsome than the dull words with which men appealed in their name to our fears, our superstitions, and our selfishness?

The old selfish type of piety, which makes God a patron and man a favorite, is irreconcilable with the new ethics. There must be a new type of piety, equivalent to a new religion, to express the outlook that life assumes from the new moral centre. The old terms of religion change their meaning, to express new thoughts. The name of God, no longer a monarch with favors to grant and rebels or enemies to subjugate, stands for the fact of the great and mysterious life which flows in and through all. Personal names, such as "our Father," emphasize the fact of a real spiritual relation in which all stand toward the eternal life. Worship, prayer, communion, ceasing to mean mere personal petition, come to be the attitude of a heathful soul that only wants what God wants,— the growth, perfection, and blessedness of the brotherhood, that sets no personal favors for itself against the good of its fellows, that places its own good at the service of the whole body. When our love prays, then only do we adequately pray. To bow before the sublime question, What would God have me do for my brothers? is to worship. The new attitude or centre is that from which the world seems alive with possibilities of growth and good. To the new attitude, the wonderful, mysterious universe is enshrouded in light. No words can describe what God has in store, what reaches of higher development are before his children. It is enough that the individual soul is in the hands of God, that only good can come from him, that the good of the whole family bears the best good of the individual with it. Thus, the new piety which befits the new ethics is an attitude reverent,

Hosted by Google

serene, and fearless in the face of the mysteries of life, trustful toward the universe and its mighty laws, toward the unknown future, toward the adorable Life unifying all, with which the eager, thoughtful, aspiring, loving soul of man is akin, as a sunbeam is akin to the light or a child to the father. As the new ethics summed up into a definite committal of one's self to treat every one else as a brother, so the new piety sums up into the kindred thought *to think and trust and live as a child of God.*

It is idle to ask which is first and greatest, the new ethics or the new piety, righteousness or religion. They are inseparable and identical. If religion is to feel the binding sense of our relations to a universe, if it is to own our place toward God, the One in and through the all, if it is to think and live like a son of God, then ethics is the practical side of religion. Whether you know it by a religious name or not, you have taken the attitude of religion when, once for all, you have devoted your life to the brotherhood. Neither is there any adequate philosophy of the new ethics that suggests why our souls should be filled with delight at its ideals, why its commands stir our souls, why its "peace passeth understanding"; in short, why it especially suits man's life — there is no philosophy of the new ethics that does not in some form, we care not in what language, write God as its key and summary. Nay, no prophet of the new ethics yet lifted his voice to persuade, who, when his heart kindled to speak of its eternal sanctions, the unalterable laws, its constraining urgency, and the vast hopes toward which humanity moves, did not utter the eloquence of a profound religious faith.

Though we care little what language men use to express the new ethics and the new piety, there are certain names and terms which serve as word-tools to make our meaning clear. If we call ourselves Christians, it is because Jesus Christ was the herald of the new ethics. His distinctive gospel was salvation from the pride and egotism of the old and brutish moral order, which has proved itself to be no valid order at all. We can never too often repeat our Unitarian definition of Christianity. It is being as Christ was. It is doing as Christ did. It is the new type of life; that is, living as though you were a son of God, which the personal name of Jesus Christ is the fittest word-tool to illustrate. We will call that life Christian which models by the new standard. We will call the other type of life heathen, though we lapse into it ourselves, as representing the old selfish world before the ideal of the brotherhood dawned in it. Let the name of the Christ stand, if you will, for the voice of the divine love, speaking in and through us. What does the Christ spirit or the love of man bid us do? For whatever the Christ spirit bids, in the name of the brotherhood, that we stand committed to do; where the Christ spirit points, there must we go. The individual man is only the channel through which the love of the brotherhood moves and acts.

Do you not see how utterly different this standard is from the other, which at every point wanted first to be assured whether the individual

Hosted by Google

should have personal advantage, whether the ideal thing was safe or practicable? Whereas, the new ethics proceeds in noble trust to its mission, and leaves the individual interests to the will of the Almighty.

The realities make the names or word-tools. The fact *Christianity* is larger than the name. The fact *theism* is larger than any name of theism. The thing *worship* is more than any form of worship. We have always been used to saying this. We need not fear new forms of saying it. Surely, nothing is so dangerous as to raise words, which are only symbols, into things, as though you had got the thing, "Pure Christianity," when you have persuaded men to say the word, or had not got the thing because it is not regularly labelled.

Side by side in a community there are two men. One of them uses the familiar word-tools of religion,— God and Christ and worship; but his aim in life is essentially self-regardful,— to get as much as he can for himself. His neighbor does not chance to use the word-tools that we are wonted to; but the man's heart is possessed by a self-abandoning, generous love. His chivalry is in the way of his worldly success, in the face of the cruel competitive struggle in which men are pushing each other like brutes. Which of these two men, by our Unitarian principles, are we instinctively in sympathy with? Which is the man we most need to help us make a church? What says Channing Unitarianism to this question? Nay, what think you says Jesus Christ? So with the vastly larger class, who call themselves by orthodox names. Our question is not of names, but of things. Where are the men whose predominant interest is the love and service of the brotherhood? Our fundamental relation to such is agreement on the basis of the new ethics,— a basis as compared with which the old theological kind of Unitarianism was but superficial.

The churches bear the marks of a seething transition. The old ethics and the new struggle in them for mastery. The old type of piety decays. The new piety only here and there shows itself. Men look on, and wonder what is coming to pass or whether religion will abide. There is a growing sense of dissatisfaction, unrest, and inconsistency in the churches and outside of them. Men call themselves Christians who believe avowedly in war, struggle for office and place, turn legitimate business into gambling, and make their own pleasure the chief aim of life. If such men are Christians, why should the weary world want Christianity? It wants Jesus' kind of Christianity,— a finer justice, a fearless truth, a great love.

Our Unitarian churches are characterized by the same want of definite principle and purpose, by the same conflict of opposing standards, as one sees in the other churches about them. To quote the words of a clear-sighted man of business, "No churches are more essentially worldly than our Unitarian churches." Mr. Emerson laid his prophetic finger close to the same truth, when he spoke of "the pale negations of Unitarianism." We have appealed to the intellect that inquires and doubts. We have appealed to men's individualism, the same self-regardful basis of which the

Hosted by Google

world already is weary. With noble exceptions, we have not, as churches, been committed more than other churches to do and give and suffer for the good of man. We have been barely civil, but not hospitable, to the poor and humble. Our tendency, especially in the cities, has been to become private and exclusive club-houses. Except as individuals, we have been shy of great questions. We have lacked earnestness as regards all reforms; and the more reform was anywhere needed, the more timid we have been. For teaching plain men and women and children the essentials of life,— to be humble, noble, generous, self-forgetful, trustful,— it would be idle to claim that our Unitarian churches had any monopoly over the churches around them. On the contrary, we have practically said to a man what other churches have been saying, You may crowd and compete and be selfish, and, provided you do it by process of law and say our good words with us, you may be a good Unitarian. We have substantially said, You may struggle to gain the ends of personal ambition, and, when you get into office, you will become a representative Unitarian. We have all said this; and, though we have made worldliness — *i.e.*, the self-regardful life — more decent and respectable than it was ever before made in the world, we have not ceased to be worldly. This is the reason why, with our simple and rational faith, we have not succeeded in winning the people around us; for no church can be worldly,— *i.e.*, self-regardful,— and live.

The period in which we live is more critical for our churches than is commonly supposed. It is more critical for us than for others, in that we are trying to do a harder and higher thing,— to unite the reason with the spirit of love. It is critical in the same way as the time of youth is critical. For, unless the life now takes on the new growth of maturity, it will run out and perish. So with our churches, which, if they think to remain in the old traditional lines, are doomed. The times are ready for a new ideal of the Church.

The only church that is to be is the brotherhood of those who, renouncing the old ethics of the self-regardful life, commit themselves to the new life of love, as Jesus showed it. This church demands constant sacrifice of every man who will join it. We know not what sacrifice it may be, in these changing and critical times,— whether of money or place, or favorite habits of thought or prejudice. This church will not let one soul say of its ideal, The thing is right, but it costs too much to do. It is a church of men pledged to say, *Whatever is right, that we will help bring about.* This is the sort of ethical church which the world longs for.

So far as we know, there is no such church of the new ethics anywhere yet. There is no church of men and women distinctively pledged to renounce the self-regardful life, to do whatever the love of man bids. But there are attempts toward it in every direction. There is a dawning sense of the imperative need of such a church. If we mistake not, the growing unrest among men, and even the struggles of socialism, are the birth-throes

Hosted by Google

of such a church as Jesus, if he were here again, might recognize as what he hoped to found.

We speak with sympathy. If we arraign our churches with grave charges, it is because we love them; because our people are sound at heart; because our free organization admits the movements of life; because, indeed, a church that stands on the basis of the new ethics almost must be Unitarian in the broadness of its fellowship and the quickness of its affinities with all who love the good of man,— with such individuals as Mr. Adler, on the one hand, who have given up a religion which they found to be essentially selfish; and great numbers in the so-called orthodox churches, on the other hand, who are trying to redeem Christianity from the pagan spirit that has usurped its name.

The committal of our churches to the new ethics is the key to a revival of the spirit of piety, to a new understanding of the meaning and use of worship, both public and private. Let a brotherhood of men and women meet together to consider what they shall do, to contemplate their ideals, to free themselves of their egotism, their exclusiveness, their pride, to enter into the mood of pity for man's sufferings, of sympathy, of helpfulness, of courage,— what is this mood but the worship of the new piety? This mood almost must express itself in noble words, in hymns and songs, in the outpouring of the soul toward God. The instinct of our feebleness, of our failures and mistakes, is to seek the eternal Presence together, where our spirits bow in humility. We shall mistake if we give the life instincts of our souls no utterance.

The new ethics will kindle the flame that has died out in thousands of homes on the family altar of devotion. For you cannot make the home what the new ethics demands without quiet, serious moments, when the whole household together enter into the restful mood of consecration. You cannot make the day of toil what it should be so well in the home where no time is caught for holy and beautiful words, for facing toward the Jerusalem of your ideals, for taking hands, as it were, together in love,— yes, when toils press, for throwing aside all cares in the presence of the Eternal Helper. Neither can you stir the souls of your children to the beautiful life of the brotherhood without the hours of serious, reverent, trustful mood; without the ancient models of instruction, which shall make them recognize themselves as brothers, the children, not of dust, but of the spirit.

So, with private worship, nothing but the spirit of consecration will permanently stir piety in man's soul or bring a sense of the reality of God. You can have the peace of God, when you want it to bless and help men with, not as a private possession or luxury.

We might have begun on the other side, and supposed a church committed to the new piety, whose outlook on the world was of boundless faith and hope, whose members held themselves bound to the life of the children of God. We should have come out at the same result. You cannot commit yourself to live or worship, in public or private, like sons of God, with

Hosted by Google

any dim sense of what this means, and not show forth the new ethics. No pride, exclusiveness, egotism, contempt of social inferiors, selfish ambition or indulgence, greed or covetousness, lives a moment in the heart of him who worships God under the name of the Infinite Love. From the mood of worship, you shall go forth to serve the brotherhood of man, in sympathy with every soul that belongs to it, or else it has not been true worship at all.

The dominant idea of which we speak, which characterizes the new ethics and the new piety, which runs like a golden thread through all human experience, through history, through all sacred Scripture, is love. The highest word in the New Testament is this: "For love is of God, and every one that loveth is begotten of God and knoweth God. He that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him." As Mr. Browning beautifully expresses the same: —

> "For life, with all its yields of joy and love
> And hope and fear,— believe the aged friend,—
> Is just our chance of the prize of learning love,
> How love might be, hath been, indeed, and is;
> And that we hold thenceforth to the uttermost
> Such prize, despite the envy of the world,
> And, having gained truth, keep truth: that is all."

This dominant idea, hardly yet fairly tried or put into practice, like an unfailing clew, determines all conduct and solves all problems. It transforms duty from the pressure of an outward command into a vital inward motive.

No one has to go far to see the changes which a committal of ourselves to the new ethics of the brotherhood would necessitate in our churches. They would adapt themselves instinctively to wield a new influence in our communities. Their forms and organizations would take on the flexibility of life. They would make themselves attractive to men. They would introduce new relations, where masters and men now quarrel and contend. They would take hold of reform with earnest and serious hands. They would purify political life, wherever men were banded together, to seek nothing for themselves, but the good of the city or State. They would check and conquer drunkenness, when friendly people, able to control appetite themselves, with one consent raised the question, How can we help our brothers, whom appetite has made its slave? The genuine missionary spirit would exorcise the petty spirit of denominational pride. We should be ashamed to contend about names, the more we cared for realities. Worthier, earnest-minded, and religious leaders would come to the front in our churches, to teach in our Sunday-schools, to direct and enlarge our activities.

Finally, we have tried to utter our faith, to show what alone helps us in these changing times, to be religious, to believe in an overruling Power, to entertain hope in the face of the mysteries of life and death. Our faith

Hosted by Google

in New England churches was that the New England churches had created other organizations to do that work for them.

All the same, they must not forget whose work it is. It is God's work, under Christ's directions. It will never do itself in godless hands; and when it is left to godless administration, as of some Bumble or Gradgrind, such as Mr. Dickens describes, it is not done at all. The Church compels it. The Church must maintain and oversee it. And this means, simply, each church must have a charitable organization, to keep loyally and constantly in mind its duties to all who are in need.

I am requested to make some statement of the work which, in practice, our churches may attempt in such matters. The time given me will hardly admit an illustration. I can simply make a few suggestions of possible activities. Other people may take and make the exceptions, and show why and how, in this or that case, such activities are impossible.

First, the Church should remember that the Church founded the State, and all its institutions, and that to the Christian gospel we owe all that we call republican government. "He who is greatest among you shall be your servant." This is the text of democracy. The Church then keeps an eye on its creature. If within the region of which a church is the centre there is any "public institution," so called, as a poorhouse, house of correction, blind asylum, hospital, or home for the deaf or the insane or the intemperate, this institution, simply because it is there, is a part of the parish. The church arrangements for charity should be facile enough and prompt enough to supply the inevitable deficiencies in the rather modern movements of public administration.

This does not mean that the minister, of necessity, is to undertake such supply. The Church is the body of all God's children,—so far as they know they are God's children; and, if it understands itself, it enlists all of them in such service. A boy who carries a box of tin soldiers into the children's surgical ward of a hospital, or plays a game of dominoes with two or three of the little waifs he finds there, is just as much in the ministry of that Church as if he went there girt with an alb and a chasuble, with a *beretta* on his head and a crucifix in his hands. That church is a wise church which has had such provision that such a boy can be attached in such service.

I name that single instance to show what I mean when I speak of the region assigned to a church.

In the good old days,—which may possibly soon return,—when we had one church, and only one, in a small township, there was no difficulty then in saying what that district was. In larger towns and in our sectarian developments of Christianity, the churches of a town will be wise if they divide the territory between themselves, so that no one need overstep another's limits, and so that each church may go to work on a defined region, with some hope of doing what it sets out to do. We had in Boston, once, such a division of the territory among fifteen Unitarian churches; and the

Hosted by Google

work of that division exists to this day. I think our districts were too large, but took the whole town, because the National Church had good reason for asking no help from dissenters. In my own opinion, a district of six hundred families, or say three thousand people, would be quite large enough. Remember that, under the Poor Law, the public authority takes most of the expensive charge of the charities, the sickness, care of the exiles, and even pretends to reform the sinners in this region. I certainly would not begin in my district by scattering tracts, what is technically called seed, on the sidewalks. I should think they would fare much as seed on a sidewalk would. No! I should begin by appointing a motherly, affectionate, prudent woman, of much sense, of great heart, and of strong constitution, large experience, as the friendly nurse in this region. I should ask her to make her office in the church, or close by it. I should notify all the doctors in the neighborhood that she was ready every day to visit all people so poor that they needed nursing which they could not pay for. She would know all the nurses in any hospital or other infirmary; and she would find out when they wanted a reader in the blind ward, or a boy with tin soldiers, or a girl with paper dolls. She would encourage the young people of the church to go with her on her daily rounds, wherever they could be of use. On their part, they are glad to be of use, and would be glad to second her. She would turn to the Ladies' Society for her sheets and pillow-cases, her day-shirts and night-shirts, her flannels, blankets, rocking-chairs, wheel-chairs, night-lamps, and the paraphernalia of sickness. Every greenhouse and garden in the parish would gradually open itself to her for flowers for her sick people. And the contribution box would supply her with all the money she needed. Such a person does not need much money.

Beginning with this domestic missionary, a church will extend its charity work in an American town right and left where it is needed. And it will very soon find, to its great joy, that it is not needed in many lines of life where the novels and newspapers have given a supposition that much eleemosynary work is needed. The analogies of Europe, fortunately, fail us entirely. But there will always be lines in which the church can interest itself, even if they are only tentative, and if its work before long is adopted by some other constituency. Mr. Charles Barnard invented the evening schools of Boston, and established them in Warren Street Chapel, — schools which are now a part of the regular work in education conducted by the city. Our brother, George Chaney, established in the same way, at Hollis Street Church, the first industrial school in Boston,—an enterprise which has also extended itself to be a part of the public system. The history of Boston sewing-schools is the same.

Just such experiments are open to every church which understands what is meant by the word "poverty" and by the correlative word "charity." Poverty does not mean eating crusts of brown-bread or starving for want of them. It means need of anything. And there is many

Hosted by Google

a man who can feast luxuriously, even at the table of the United States, who is yet very, very poor. The church, as with eagle eye, watches for such destitution. It has to provide employment for the rich quite as often as for the poor. It has to educate the eye to beauty, the heart to sympathy, the lip to tenderness, quite as often as it has to train the hand to industry or to provide milk for babes. It is no true church, unless it is on the lookout for such opportunities. With every effort to meet them, it knows how to meet them better. Blessed are the merciful; for they gain more and more of the resources, the faculty, and the infinite enterprise of mercy.

Hosted by Google

THE MISSIONARY WORK OF THE CHURCH.

BY REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

"THE DATA OF ETHICS" is the capstone of Herbert Spencer's great system of synthetic philosophy; and the keystone of his *Data of Ethics* are the chapters on Egoism and Altruism, in which he shows how, in the enlargement of life, the thought of self must pass over into a concern for others. Only the lower forms of life precipitate all their energies into self-preserving and self-satisfying forms. With every expansion come an increase of concern for others, more complex relations and far-reaching sympathies. Only the lowest animals are wholly solitary, and so only the lowest forms of religion are wholly selfish. The savage lives for self; the civilized man, for family, country, race. The former recognizes most of mankind as enemies; the latter, all of mankind as brothers. And so the method and ritual of cruder systems are purely self-protecting. Their rites are for the purpose of keeping away demons, their schemes are intended to shield the soul from fire of one kind or another; while the higher ritual, the method of the nobler religion, is a splendid forgetting of one's self in holy desire to help others. It is a search for a balm to distracted souls. It is pitiful. Its invitation is, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Its commission is, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature"; and the response of every true devotee at these higher shrines is the Pauline exclamation, "Woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!" Max Müller's division of the great religions of the world into missionary and non-missionary suggests a vital principle. Religion is an inclusive term, covering all of man's attempts to discover and adjust his relations to the infinite. It reaches from the dread of a devil up to the love of God. But only such forms of it command our respect or have claims upon our interest as arise to that serene love of truth which has made the name of Socrates glorious, that renunciation which has made Buddha the light of Asia, and those heights of self-sacrifice and love that have given to Jesus his world-conquering power. A church is a company of men and women gathered in the interest of religion. Its value to the world and claims upon us are to be determined by its missionary purpose and power. It must not only have a gospel, but a great determination to preach that gospel.

The Unitarian Church has a gospel. In common with all forms of religion, it stands for the solemnities of life. It is to speak thoughtful words to frivolous souls. It is to make conscious that touch of the infinite

Hosted by Google

which impinges upon the finite. In common with all Christendom, the Unitarian Church is to preserve the traditions of heroism, to tell the story of loyalty, to glory in the devotion that has manifested itself in the life, death, and subsequent following of the great missionary of Nazareth. Whatever of beauty goes with cathedral or crusade, whatever of tenderness gathers around nunnery or hospital, the still unexhausted wisdom found in the writings of Christian Fathers, the lore conserved by Catholic monks, the spiritual power generated by Protestant sects and synods, the stimulating stories of Luther, Knox, and Wesley, all that is moving in evangelical gospel and hymn,— are our common inheritance. They represent the gospel we hold in common with our sister Churches. They contain wealth enough to keep any Church busy for some centuries yet. But, if these were all, it might well be asked, Why build one more church in a community where churches are seldom filled? Because, in addition to all this common inheritance, we have some great emphases that are not so common. The Unitarian Church is called into the world to emphasize the gospel of love, or, if you please, the love of the gospel; to put the superlative emphasis on character.

How are we to preach this gospel?

The Unitarian Church that would be equal to this message-bearing must never forget the unit that is the basis of its measurement. The missionary society is, comparatively, a modern invention. No such society for the evangelization of Macedonia sent out Paul. St. Columba and St. Patrick, the great mediæval apostles that sowed pagan Europe with Christian seed, were not appointed by a conference. They were not examined by the secretary of any board, and yet they did a mighty work.

The best advocacy for the religion of character is done by demonstrating it rather than describing it. The Church that wants to do a real stroke of missionary work for religion should give an illustration of it in real life. Let it be the thing it professes, do the thing it admires, practise what it preaches. The Unitarian Church, believing in no vicarious scheme, should beware of falling into the most undignified of vicarious dependences. A man who says, "I leave my wife to attend to the religion of the family," is a victim of the most orthodox superstition I know of. The church that delegates its life and activities to the pastor or a chosen few, whom it may call trustees, Sunday-school workers, etc., is in a bad way. If the Unitarian Church has any claims whatever upon its members, they are serious ones. If it lays any duties at the door of any member, they are such as cannot be delegated. I doubt if even a Unitarian church can do much for the man who only attends it once a month or "when he feels like it." Occasional church-going, or a vagabond church-life that goes first here and then there, brings all the penalties of the vagabond life. You neither give nor get good from that to which you do not give of yourself. So, if we would have a missionary church, it must be made of missionary men and women. I would save this phrase from the missionary cant. I do not

Hosted by Google

mean men and women who despise this world in the supposed interest of another, nor those who, remembering the benighted of Africa, forget the besotted across the street; but I mean men and women of conviction,— men and women who are not afraid to stand up and be counted for what they believe, who mean to throw their full weight on the right side every time,— men and women who want to count one each in the moral and spiritual statistics of the world. Missionary work must begin with individuals.

But still it is too late in the day to forget the fable of the bundle of fagots. The strength of one is augmented when joined to the strength of many. Something of the power of all goes into each. "The missionary society," of which I have spoken as comparatively modern, is, on that account, not less worthy of respect. It came in the "fulness of time." It blossomed in the springtime of a larger fellowship. It is in itself a noble testimony to the power of the gospel of unity. Some day, when the story of the missionary societies is written without prejudice on the one side and without cant on the other, when it will be studied as a part of the history of humanity rather than as the story of a sect, it will stand out unparalleled in the history of the world. The faith, courage, self-denial, business sagacity, and far-reaching zeal which have carried the story of the cross around the world — ay, which have literally discovered a great part of the world for the sake of telling the story — are as beautiful as they are sublime. Let no vision of mistakes, crudities, and failures make us blind to the sublimity.

The splendid altruism that in 1882 gathered in the British realm over $6,000,000 for this work, and perhaps one-half that much in America, ought to shame the so-called Churches, whose chief object and hope seem to be to perpetuate themselves, who flatter themselves as doing very well if they come to their annual meeting with their expenses all paid, or if there can be a loyal few who will ease their conscience toward a hungry, benighted world by paying off the unholy arrearages that have accrued in paying the expenses of professional singers to do some vicarious singing for them, and for similar extravagant luxuries, which are made to seem like something other than extravagant luxuries because indulged in in the church, and are covered by the word "religion."

That was a brave and startling resolution embodied into the constitution of a religious body organized a short time ago, which provided that at least one-fourth of its revenue should forever be set aside for humanitarian and philanthropic purposes. A most Christian example is this, given by a society that does not assume the title to so many who do so boastfully claim it. The church that has any right to be is the church whose main business it is to look away from itself, whose chief study it is to bless rather than to be blessed, that is the home of a thought which is diffusive, the centre of a life which is magnetic and contagious, that is at the Lord's business upon the working as well as upon the resting days of the week. This church should resist the temptation to interpret the Mosaic legends

Hosted by Google

as if God had done all the work there was to do on the first six days of the creative week, except what little he had left for his chosen few on the seventh forever after. The highest offices of the church are not ministerial. It is most helpful when it is a school of serious thought, when it is the home of social communion and worship.

The missionary work of the church is never measured by its dollars; but inasmuch as money in its last analysis is accumulated labor, preserved human energy, and in the giving of it one gives himself in a very real sense, and sometimes in the most effective and available way, no church or individual can fully discharge its missionary obligation without the giving systematically, generously, and perpetually. Here, again, it is not the service of the few, but of the many, which grows potent. The "Peter's pence" enriched the coffers of Rome, when the resources of kings and nobles failed. It is not the Methodist million*aires*, but the Methodist millions, that give that Church its splendid revenue. "It ish de nickel pisness vhat pays," said the German grocer to me the other day, as he sat beside me in the street-car. "See de beer pisness and de street-car pisness! De best money-making pisness in Chicago; and dey are nickel pisness." Not until the Unitarians get down to the universality of the nickel will our churches become effective missionary churches. Then will they be strong with the potency of consecrated dollars. Financially, as otherwise, we must get rid of the vicariousness that still lurks in our churches. The woman who, either from choice or from necessity,—and too often, I fear, it is the latter,—says, "I can't give anything for this cause,—my husband pays the bills, and does all the subscribing,—but I will help get up a fair or wait on the table," is in almost as bad a way religiously as the husband previously spoken of; and the young man or young woman who is a constant attendant upon the ministrations of the church, but is not a systematic contributor to the cause it represents, because not married or having no family, very likely finds the spiritual nature debilitated by that which seems to be so profitable. One of the many bad results of the modern pew-renting system is that it makes of the man of the house rather than every individual — man, woman, or child — the financial unit of the church. The poor man that will not give the dollar which he can spare, because he cannot give the five dollars he must not spare, is in as bad a way spiritually as the capitalist who is too busy to consider the claims which are of all claims the most imperative in life. "It ish de nickel pisness vhat pays." Every purse-holder, however slender the purse, ought to remember that there is missionary power in the nickel.

Last April, I distributed among the children of my Sunday-school and some of the adults a little jug of orthodox invention, that they might save their pennies for the furnishing fund of our church. The other day, we took out of fifty of the jugs — they are not all in yet — about $125. Now, I venture to say that no other $125 has gone into that church building which represented so much good-will, thoughtfulness, consecration, as that

Hosted by Google

jug money. We took out of those jugs seventeen hundred pennies, the exact equivalent of how many sticks of candy it is not difficult to guess. Over five hundred nickels and three hundred dimes represent how many glasses of soda water, dishes of ice-cream, or fine ribbons for the hair! It is the aggregation of these small self-denials that make great souls after a while. "It ish de nickel pisness vhat pays." This is a saying well worth remembering for churches as well as individuals, in giving up their vanities. If it is followed out, it is as profitable to them as to the beer-seller. It provokes calculation. Let us see how it would work. I fully agree with the saying of Brother Herford, that there is now open to the Unitarian denomination no missionary opportunity which will bring so large returns for the amount of money invested as the Church Building Loan Fund. Now, if some generous, wealthy man, of which the Unitarian Church has many, were to offer us to-day $10,000 to that fund, providing the churches throughout the land would subscribe $10,000 more during the next year, how glad Brother Herford would be and how hard he would work to meet the conditions! and we would all help him, and the thing would be done. But suppose we didn't wait for this wealthy man to stir our stagnant Siloam, and each of us took home a jug, determined to set aside a nickel a day for the next two years from this day for this purpose. We won't count Sundays and holidays,— say just three hundred working-days a year would give us $15 a year. There are at least two thousand Unitarians in and around this Conference from whom such a jug would exact very little self-denial, but a great deal of thoughtfulness. In two years from now, these jugs could be brought or sent back; and we would take out of them $60,000 to the Loan Building Fund. "It ish de nickel pisness vhat pays." The secret of full coffers for our missionary activities is found in getting something from everybody. The church that trusts its missionary funds to a haphazard collection or an appropriation of the trustees, who have always an anxious eye out for the arrearages, will always fail grievously of doing its full duty in this matter. Once a year, at least, a direct personal appeal should be laid at the door of each individual in church and Sunday-school; and the appeal should be made in such a way as to make each feel that it was for this end the church largely existed. There is now such diversity of missionary interests and administrations that it would seem that the most fastidious conscience in any parish could find some cause and organization to challenge its confidence and enthusiasm. It does not matter so much what missionary organization is used in our midst, only so that these high charities of mind are attended to.

This is all true, and most true if we would ever become mighty in a missionary way. We must never forget that "'tis de nickel pisness vhat pays." But its paying power comes in the saving as well as the giving. My friend, who is at the head of the biggest wire-mattress manufactory in the world, tells me that, when they began the business some ten years ago, they sold their mattresses for $9.50; but now they sell them for $1.50,

Hosted by Google

because then they sold seven thousand a year, now one hundred thousand a year. Among their most recent profits are those which come from such sources as these: Last year, they saved one cent per bed on the wood saved, three cents per bed on the wire ends that used to be thrown away, fifteen cents per bed on a better way of adjusting the corners. These three items added $15,000 to the profits of last year, and it all came from the saving. Can we fit this parable to the missionary problems of life? Are there no slight indulgences and insidious extravagances that can be cut off, and thus increase our available margin for the propagation of this great gospel that is ours?

Yet this lesson of the nickel should not be taken for more than it is worth. Wealth brings a responsibility that no faithfulness of poverty can discharge. The widow's mite should bring shame to the purse-proud, just as surely to-day as when it first caught the eye of that discriminating prophet of souls in the temple at Jerusalem.

> "Two mites, two drops, but all her house and land,
> Fell from an earnest heart, but trembling hand.
> The others' wanton wealth foamed high and brave.
> The others cast away: she only gave."

Every dollar in the world represents, at least, three investments. First, the deposit of posterity, the contribution made to it by the once toiling but now silent dead. Our Aryan fore elders, who first put the plough into the fields of Central Asia, began to earn the dollar that is now in my pocket, if there be one there. The second deposit in that dollar is nature's contribution,— air, water, and earth, the raw material which is given to no one, which belongs to every one. The last contribution to my dollar, and I fear the smallest one, is my own, that which I have done to win it, that deposit of myself of which I have already spoken. Of this last part, I may in truth be said to be possessor, and can do with it as I please, if so I please to act in harmony with the forces of the universe. Of the other two portions of my dollar, I am certainly no more than trustee,— an uninstructed trustee, it is true. I may administer as I choose, but they who are to be the succeeding inheritors of the first investment and the power that gives the second will not hold him guiltless who fails to discharge the duties of a trustee and forgets the responsibilities of an administrator. When our gospel sinks into our lives deep enough to teach us how to divinely administer the inheritance of the past, the bounties of God's present and our own slender accumulations, then shall we become worthy members of a church that will accept the missionary commission to spread that potent gospel that in some poor but ever-growing fashion is represented by Unitarian men and Unitarian churches in this country.

Friends, this commission is imperative and exacting, because our gospel is much needed,— needed to-day, needed everywhere. It is needed to

Hosted by Google

make more decent our lives, more joyous and wholesome our communities. It makes it our business to persuade that lad to let the miserable cigar alone, to lift that young girl out of flippancy and selfishness, to keep yon man out of the saloon, and this woman above the seductive power of silly fashions. Ay, it becomes our business to get the saloon, with its demoralizing abominations, entirely out of our midst. The Unitarian Church is needed now by the woman who goes to church to mumble a creed she does not understand and cannot believe. It is needed by the man who has no higher use for his Sundays than to lie abed until he is stupid, and then get up to smoke himself cross, and go back to his business on Monday morning with no celestial gleams upon his soul, caught in the radiance of Sunday hill-tops. The Unitarian Church has a work to do to rationalize religion and religionize reason, to join in holy wedlock morals and religion, to put together in the hearts and lives of men that which, in the heart of God, has always been one and inseparable. It is needed to teach the very children that religion is glorified morality and morals realized religion. Ethics, instead of being a term of contempt, representing something far below religion, something commonplace, something flat and unprofitable, must be made the pole-star of the soul, toward which it sails through the darkness of sin and selfishness. It is to become the poet's ecstasy, the inspiration of the laborer, the ideal of the soul, and the desire of all nations. It is to be recognized as the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, the word of the Lord, the love and law of God himself. This gospel teaches that conscience is the only road to heaven. It makes life, not doctrine, the test of religion, character the only credential of piety, honesty the only savior, rectitude the only salvation, justice the great judgment of God, and a loving spirit his atoning grace. Our gospel is the good news that helpfulness to one's neighbor is holiness to the Lord, that kindness is the best evidence of a prayerful spirit, that the graces of heaven are none other than the moralities of earth raised to commanding pre-eminence. Is not this something great to preach, something worthy to be said on Sunday, under the sanctions of the Church, invoking all the solemnities of worship to give it religious power?

O friends, as I brood upon these things, see the great need of this gospel, and sometimes catch glimpses of the forces that are coming to preach it and live it, I am led to believe that we are at the threshold of a glorious era in religion. We are on the threshold of a magnificent revival. The spirit of God that has brooded in the hearts of Channing, Parker, Emerson, Martineau, and all the major poets of this generation, is about to take fire, and flash upon the common intelligence of the men and women of every-day toil and life. The multitude is beginning to understand what these prophets mean or, rather, what God has been saying through them. The wires are being laid among the throbbing lives of men and women. When the electric currents are intelligently established, there will be felt again the ever-youthful power of prophecy: there will be such an abandon-

Hosted by Google

ment of the dingy rookeries of theology, such a piling away of creeds in old lumber attics, such a discarding of pretended beliefs, such a declaration of real beliefs, such new readings of old Bibles and fresh appreciation of old texts, such modern exemplifications of old revelations, as the world only sees in its epoch-marking movements. These movements come only as the centuries come,— slowly, quietly, in response to the great divine forces that are working out of the heart of the eternal God.

Hosted by Google

ARBITRATION AND ITS RELATION TO STRIKES.

BY WILLIAM B. WEEDEN.

A MAN of moderate but independent fortune, living in the suburb of a large village, awakes on a cold December morning, and finds the furnace fire out, the house chilled and cheerless in the gray dawn. He rings for a fire, but gets no answer. Then his wife sleepily tells him the condition of the family affairs. He had come home late at evening, and did not know of a certain unpleasantness occurring after supper. The mother with an infant had rebuked a nurse, whose duties conjoined those of a housemaid, for snapping the fingers of a sensitive, three-years-old girl, intrusted to her charge. The Most Worthy Nursing Mistress of the District Association of Nursery Maids had telephoned at once that nurses must have the right to snap children with the thumb and finger, or universal society would dissolve into its primitive elements of savagery. The mother — believing in the right of parents to discipline their own children, and not experienced enough to know that mistresses must obey their servants — discharged the rebellious maid. The cook was a fifth cousin of the nurse, and moreover, in the forenoon, had asked for more wages. It was not in human nature that she should remain silent in such a discussion, and she interfered loudly and effectively. She was an old hand,—of much influence in the higher circles of the order of cooks. While the mistress sobbed in the parlor, the telephone reported the discord of the family at head-quarters. The Most Ancient Master of Gastronomic Artists had signified that an economic deficiency in wages, combined with a wound in the sensibilities of a fifth cousin, involved grave questions, affecting the whole permanency of the relations of capital and labor; that, pending the question of wages, an apology must be rendered by the mistress, or not a chop could be broiled or a dish washed in that household. Hence, the deadlock in the affairs of that mistaken housekeeper,— the oppressor of her kind.

The wife and mother proceeds to build the kitchen fire, and attempt a breakfast. The father should have made the fire, and put the kettle on; but, unfortunately, having mail contracts, he must be at the railway station before breakfast, to superintend his own business. In the midst of the household reports, he runs to the stable for his horse and buggy, always ready at that hour. He finds the stable closed; and his excellent man, Patrick, lounging about, listless, yet respectful. In a shamefaced way, he said that he was sorry that he could not lift a finger for a gentleman who had always treated him well; but the interrupted privileges of the nursemaid, the outraged sensibilities of the thrifty cook, had convulsed the

Hosted by Google

highest circles of the protective associations of the employed. The General Meddlesome Patriarch of the Amalgamated Order of Coachmen, Hostlers, Gardeners, Washerwomen, Cooks, Housemaids, Nurses, Butlers, and Scullions, had ordained that the whole domestic affair should be submitted to arbitration. Pending the decision, a general strike of the household was ordered. The Patriarch had considered, in council, a general strike of all the households in the village. But the telephone wires not working surely, on account of a storm, the more moderate thought it better to begin with the household in question. Only ten minutes remaining for the oppressor of his kind to get to his business, as he espies a man in the street, he offers him a half-dollar for instant help in harnessing the horse. The man answers reluctantly that, though he needs money to buy bread for his own family, the hostlers on either side of the street had warned him of a broken head, if he should interfere with the rights of labor in that stricken household.

Fables have illustrated truth since literature began. Though these incidents seem grotesque in the relation, they differ in no essential principle from daily occurrences in our industrial life, when it is disorganized by the irruption of strange and unnatural forces. These new powers, seizing the latest forms of organization,— created to construct,— turn them to the destruction of the organisms of industry. The sudden shock of a strike jars down the whole delicate fabric of industry, and deranges the social order on which that fabric rests. The mischief done,— the vital forces of production destroyed,— then a judicial procedure is proposed, and arbitration is summoned to award justice,— justice, where contracts are broken, property destroyed, personal rights and liberty overwhelmed by mob violence, either committed or apprehended and feared. There is not a tittle of exaggeration in the allegory. Industrial life is even more complex than domestic households. These fantastic situations, not present, but possible, only bring home to each individual man and woman the keen anguish which industrial leaders directly, the whole community indirectly, suffer from the arrogant action of hordes drilled to ape the ways of civilization, to use civilized forces to destroy the organisms civilization has built up.

The incidents of the fable are not chosen hap-hazard. The questions agitating society are not economic alone, or in the greatest part. Sentiment as well as self-interest impels men to attack the present social order. Wages are wanted, but more is wanted. A new deal is sought, not only in money and property, but in all the social advantages accumulated by experience and culture. The disturbances proceed not from the bitter cry of outcast society. It is well-paid labor which demands more and yet more, excluding and maltreating all orders of society not so well conditioned as itself. An enormous majority vote, using the secret methods of a despotism, is to crush the present order of society, and right the wrongs of labor.

Hosted by Google

For concrete information, let us review briefly the main facts of one strike as it occurred last spring. This deranged or suspended totally the industries of half a dozen great States,— the territory of an empire. The difficulty began in the discharge from the Texas Pacific Railway Company of a foreman in their shops at Marshall, named Hall. Captain Henry, of Cleveland, Ohio, was delegated by the United States Circuit Court to investigate the facts afterward. He stated that Hall was a "worthless workman by reason of his indifference to his duties, his attention being absorbed in studying the rules of the Knights of Labor, and devoting time to committee work for his order that should have been given to the railroad company." Captain Henry examined the company's books; and, under Hall's foremanship, the work in the shops "had cost the company fifty per cent. more than it did under his predecessor." The strike, first on the Texas Pacific, then on the Missouri Pacific, was ordered by Martin Irons. And who was he? Born in Scotland, a machinist by trade, a rover in fact, he had been a Knight of Labor about one year. After three months' service, he became Master of his Local Assembly. In a few weeks more, he was Chairman of the Executive Board of District Assembly No. 101. This made him virtual dictator of thirty Local Assemblies from Missouri into Texas, with about five thousand members, bound by oath to obey the orders of the Chairman. Irons made a written statement, to the Congressional Committee of investigation of this strike, of the reasons why he ordered it. He stated that delegates of the Knights of Labor were sitting at Marshall just before Hall was discharged. The discharge was regarded as a slight to the order, and Irons tried to get him reinstated. Passes for three to Dallas were given to Hall, where grievances and Hall's discharge were to be discussed. The board of Knights of Labor numbered five. Moreover, the passes were handed to Hall, and not to Irons. He regarded this act as another slight on the order, and declined to use the passes or to go to Dallas, telegraphing to that effect. He telegraphed again that, unless a reply came by two o'clock the next day, he should call out the men. He received no reply, and did call the men out. "Seeing it was useless to hope for an adjustment of grievances, he afterward called out the Missouri Pacific men." These are Irons's own statements, in substance. The Congressional Committee pressed him to know what the grievances of the men actually were, and what he had done for settlement of them before ordering the strikes. He reluctantly admitted that, in the only specific grievance ever submitted to Mr. Hoxie or his officers of the Missouri Pacific, he carried his point, and it was remedied. Now, we must understand that, in the vocabulary of the Knights of Labor, a "grievance" is a sentimental injury,— not only an injustice, but a wound. We must try to comprehend this Irons, an Oriental potentate,— in dirty shirt and brass jewelry, filthy, and reeking with tobacco,— and to appreciate his chivalric sensibilities as they were lacerated by slights to his order. Goethe thought highly of the

Hosted by Google

manufacturers as "mediators" between the needs of labor and the hard instincts of capital. But this new order of elective kings displays the wrath of despots rather than the sympathy of intercessors or the equity of judges.

Despot is a hard name, but it may represent a very good thing. Despotism may mean good social order and the best adaptation of means to ends. What evidence is there that this new ruler would or could better the issues he raised, or that he even tried to comprehend them? In fact, 3,717 workers struck, assigning no definite reason, and forced out of employment 10,598 other workers on this railway system, who were contented with their lot. When Irons was questioned by the Congressional Committee of the number of strikers, he answered, "About five thousand." When asked how many more it affected, he said, "It is no concern of mine." Did he not know "that nine thousand men in the lumber business had to stop work on account of your strike"? "No: I don't concern myself with a census of the United States." Boycotts on the Texas Pacific and the Wabash systems were ordered, with as little consideration, according to his testimony,—"An injury to one in the order is an injury to all." "Missionaries" were sent out by the Executive Board to persuade men to strike. The results of the missions appear in the testimony of Joseph Cramer, who was ordered verbally, and afterward in writing, to report to the Master Workman at De Soto, Mo. The Master Workman ordered him to assist "to stop trains." He refused. "'Very well. You needn't do anything, but you can go and swell the crowd.' I replied, I didn't propose to violate any laws or make myself a criminal in any way. He told me I was a coward." This conversation was in the Knights of Labor hall. Cramer was afterwards expelled "for refusing to stop trains and damage the railroad property."

Every "missionary" has a gospel which impels him to his work. What is this new gospel? A witness before our committee read from shorthand notes a speech of Irons at a Knights of Labor meeting at East St. Louis. "Talk to the scabs. Go to their houses, and talk to their wives, and make them quit. Do everything you can to make them come out; and, if they won't, give them some pills, and —— them out. To hell with the Chinese! To hell with the scabs! We won in the Chinese fight, and we will win this."

It might be presumed from these utterances in a civilized country that a "scab" is a leper or unclean person, to be cast out from his kind. But he is simply a man holding his own opinion, and trying to exercise his right of judgment,—such a man as Philip and Alva, of Spain, roasted. Martin Irons is out of fashion just now; but turn to the testimony before our Committee of Litchman, First General Secretary of the whole order of Knights of Labor, who went to St. Louis as the authorized representative of Mr. Powderly. In defining a "scab," Litchman was asked, "Do you not acknowledge the right of any man to work and earn wages, and

Hosted by Google

support his family?" *A.*—"When you put the question abstractly in that way, I must answer it, 'Yes.' But I do not acknowledge the right of any man, at the time a great conflict is raging between labor and capital, to step in between, and scab."

In this case, "stepping in" means the conduct of men like Cramer, regularly at work, trying to do their duty and obey law, and not men seeking a new job, as it sometimes means. The power is assumed and exercised by these labor associations of extending strikes and boycotts into the business of any and all innocent parties. This deserves especial consideration from all students of political philosophy, for it goes deep into the roots of social order. A dispute affecting labor in any way, once begun, no consideration of justice or mercy can restrain the will of the order. That works, *ex cathedra*, by direct inspiration, and can make no mistake. When the Missouri strike wavered, it was proposed to strike and boycott coal mines, to bring the railways to terms. Mr. Bailey, of General Executive Board Knights of Labor, was reported as saying they would repeat the programme until all coal mining was stopped in Illinois. "Will not that cause immense suffering among innocent people?" "Probably. So does war cause immense suffering among innocent people. If the coal company refuses to accede to our demand, it is they who are responsible for the consequences, not we."

It may be asserted that Irons is not a fair type of the controlling powers in this new *imperium in imperio;* that a new order of leaders is being developed, capable of leading laborers and capitalists — all society — into better and more prosperous paths. Men like Irons always take the initiative, when a crisis arrives. But consider Powderly, the master of them all. Is his course wiser, more consistent, and more masterly, though it may lack the tigerish ferocity of Irons? He palavers about his responsibility, greater than that of kings or presidents. What does he do? In the grasp of a strong intellect, like Gould's, he loses his initiative, and bends his policy to the stronger will. Then, beaten in tactics, he shrieks like a fish-wife. He shouts hard names, and appeals to the passions of unreason throughout the whole land. Is this the work of one greater than a statesman,— a democratic Bismarck? In spite of Powderly's orderly and amiable talk, in his heart he believes in the irresponsible force at his back. Irons testified, "Labor produces everything: capital produces nothing at all." Powderly's acts confirm the same dogma. In his talk about the militia, he did not reveal any capacity of seeing in the musket the right arm of the law. He saw a lot of individuals, each one a laborer, or who might be a laborer. Therefore, he would handle his musket as labor might direct, not as the law directs. Powderly has not the first conception of the organism of society, order, law, justice, or administration. Labor does not make a railroad, nor even a shovel. Labor does not create, it cannot create. Social order, civilization, law, accumulated capital, give his opportunity to the laborer. As a laborer, he has nothing but his hands.

Hosted by Google

No massing of forces, votes of majorities of Knights, or edicts of Lichmans and Powderlys, can reverse this eternal principle: Naked thou came into the world, naked thou shalt return. These prevalent notions that Labor is a sacred essence, and the laborer its high priest, superior to all law and all experience, are absurd. If not so tragical in their results, they would be ridiculous.

An observer from another planet would say, If your premises be sound, whence the conclusion? If this be the genesis of strikes, how comes it that strikes get headway, and inflict such injury? Here is the effect, present, effective. Where and whence is the cause? How can a highly civilized community give way to the passions of barbarism, and submit to barbaric havoc? We answer: The cause is not remote: it is nearer than most of us think, within reach of any average intelligence. The cause is in you, here, now,— latent, but potential.

Pure socialism has but few advocates. It has been well said that its apostles divide into two parties and pursue two ideals. The one is absolutist,— absorbing all the productive and directing forces of society, like banks, railroads, factories, and property, into the State, substituting "scientific stirpiculture" for the family. The other is democratic, tending to anarchism, making any individual will the sole authority, superseding all government, all combination for political or social ends,— a universal *laissez-faire*. Neither of these fancies, which dominate certain small fractions of people, possesses you. Nor do they possess the laborers and workingmen to any great extent. But they affect you in your daily walk and thought, as they affect the workman at his bench or in the halls of his order. A socialistic fervor is in the air. Each generation likes experiment, and the old proven ways are prosy and dull.

When the Texas and Missouri Pacific strike began, New York as well as other intelligent communities sympathized with the strikers. Men of business and the public generally said: Well, those fellows are not getting much. Jay Gould has a great deal. Let them get more. It is so easy to disgorge others' wealth. Such ample justice rules the average economic juror as he reads telegraphic reports of distant troubles, and calmly awards a dividend of others' goods.

But soft! The fungus became decay, rot and disease seized the body politic. Transportation throttled, eight hours demanded at the price of ruin, industry palsied, farmers ruined, with barns full of crops, builders halted, contracts stopped,— Heaven spare us! This is our property, our prosperity, our social order. We meant Jay Gould. Capital is so informed with order and prosperity, so linked in every chain that binds each part of the body politic into one whole, that even the hated capitalists became dear. In the twinkling of an eye, the trembling citizens, seeing the spectre of industrial anarchy hovering over their own firesides, turned, and thought the hard sense and worldly wisdom of Jay Gould was worth saving, however unlovely his whole character might be.

Hosted by Google

I alluded to the attempt of the Executive Board Knights of Labor to stop the mining of coal, and to compel the Missouri Pacific to terms. When the general eight-hour movement was projected, the labor managers intended, if necessary, to bring on a general cessation of industry, and thus to force a shortening of the hours of labor. Direct proof of this is unnecessary. Such was the dream of the International in Europe. It is the natural and inevitable evolution of the idea underlying the Knights of Labor movement. Such a body must drift toward such a crisis, to complete logically the purpose which starts to control all society according to the will of labor.

It was unfortunate that this purpose was not worked out and accomplished. The shock of the Chicago bombs and the deaths among the gallant police ended the concordant movement of socialism and labor agitation. This wholesale murder with foul weapons drew the line between violence abhorrent to all healthy public opinion and violence which might hope to divide an obtuse public and to array a party on the side of the labor agitators. But it would have made the solution of the American problem shorter and simpler, if a general suspension of transportation and industry had been precipitated. The Anglo-Saxons have learned how to deal with political problems tending toward revolution or anarchy. We should have then learned how to treat industrial anarchy, a much more terrible situation. If the strike had been consummated in the whole land east of the Mississippi, probably flour would have moulded in Minneapolis at the same moment that it was selling in New York at fifty dollars per barrel. There are five hundred thousand, possibly seven hundred thousand, Knights of Labor. There are some seventeen out of sixty millions who labor directly for their own support. It has been fairly estimated that, if the wildest theory of the most capable agitator could be realized, not over five to six millions could ever be massed into one organization, like the Knights of Labor. How long would the whole people have submitted to the rule of these five hundred thousand tyrants, as it rent their social system and brought actual famine into the land? The people, the whole people, would have made short work of the universal strikers.

Since the Chicago massacre, the Knights of Labor have shrieked loud, and spluttered that they did not believe in bombs or in anything else not nice. They have tried to avoid the odium of anarchy. It is true, as I have stated, that the Knights of Labor and hardly any workingman believe in socialism, pure and simple. Almost to a man, they believe in property, in the family, in some form of law and order which yet admits the disorder of their order. But the socialistic ideal affects their demands.

It is so commonly asserted that labor in itself and out of itself produces all the goods on which society rests that few consider how absurd and impossible the dogma is. Claimants should show at least one social system in which the laborer has produced the goods on which that system depended. In historic fact, how has labor been initiated, moved, or con-

Hosted by Google

trolled? The savage directed his captive to labor; the barbarian directed his slave to labor; the fief-holder directed his vassal; the feudatory paid wage to his servant. As matters go to-day, who controls the workingman, laborer, trades-unionist? The employer? Not at all. Our admitted facts show that, though the employer may pay wages, just as a bank-teller pays a check, he has no control of the laborer beyond the certification of his wages in his contract. This is a disputed point in political economy. But I am considering the facts and the modern principles of action from the laborer's point of view and that of his especial advocates. In fact, the only absolute director and controller of the workingman to-day is the dollar. The mint-stamp of society, the direct force of money, is the only ruler recognized to-day by those holding the dogma that labor produces all things,— those purblind philosophers who cannot see that wealth is produced by all the powers of society, the mutual exercise of mutual desire, all together producing that living, constant demand for service, out of which labor, as labor, gets its opportunity and its reward. A short way to the dollar is the ultimate of the new doctrines and the new demands of labor.

The Knights of Labor, in convention at Cleveland, June 1, as reported, said, in a petition to Congress, "that, while human labor produces all wealth, those who have performed no honest labor have amassed the most of the wealth, and those who have performed the labor have least to enjoy; that we feel this state of things to be largely due to both vicious legislation and want of proper legislation by Congress. . . . In one part of the country, money is worth only two per cent. per annum; in another, twelve per cent.; in another, twenty per cent. . . . That you fix the measure of value by establishing a just, uniform, and invariable rate for money loaned." In the bill recommended to Congress with this petition was a provision "for the loaning of money by the government at three per cent. per annum."

This notion that a socialistic use of the powers of government, first in finance, and finally in all productive forces, will result in special benefit to labor, is one fallacy. Another is that the less there is produced, the more will be distributed; that less hours of work will afford more comforts and more culture (for a definite statement, see George Gunton in *Forum*, vol. i., p. 138). These two fallacies underlie the whole labor movement in our country.

I have outlined the motives and issues of strikes, and of the theories prompting the labor movement, not merely to arraign and condemn them. I would depict the actual forces working in the minds and passions of laborers on the one hand, and the attitude of the whole people, the tendency of public opinion, on the other, in order to explain the processes of arbitration, which is my main theme. Whatever our view of the present, we must take things as they are. Our present business is to search for any idea, any concept, which may promise to check the drift toward the chaos of strikes. Attempts to amend the situation proceed generally from theories, which class themselves in these three divisions: —

Hosted by Google

I. *Laissez-faire*, or unlimited competition; the individual right to let or hire, never interfered with, but always sustained, by legislation. To this, critics rejoin that legislation has already interfered largely with contract and with independent production; that the natural competition of each with each, of group with group, has been nullified by combinations of laborers on one side, and by closer and more thorough organizations of employers pending on the other; that peaceful industry is gone; that hostile camps have replaced the old quiet; that a new social order, though in transition, is nevertheless at work.

II. Co-operation and Profit-sharing. This method is expected by many theorists to absorb the better energies of capital, capitalizers, and laborers, to take away motives for conflict by a more harmonious joint action. Many instances of failure and a few notable successes can be shown here. Probably, most agree with Mr. Carnegie that, if successful, it would be remote; that now, under present conditions, there would be twenty failures to one success.

III. Arbitration and Conciliation. Those who have seen most of the actual conflicts of this generation, both here and in Europe, recommend arbitration, formally constituted and sanctioned by legislation, or by a public opinion more powerful than any law. It is practically established in the hosiery and manufactured iron trades in England. Indeed, both failures and successes can be cited in great numbers. But the advocates claim that, on the whole, the method gathers strength, and justifies itself.

At best, any change must be a choice of evils. If American industry had developed on its own lines, competition would have regulated the interplay of capital and labor. But alien elements have interfered. Together with the great benefits of immigration, we have received the defects and vices of a heterogeneous and undisciplined horde.

In this effervescence of social and industrial activity, arbitration fills the air. Every striker talks of it, after he has done all the mischief possible. Then he turns to this shibboleth, as if it were a panacea for all ills. The icy Mr. Gould appears to be as ready for this adjustment of difficulties as the most inflammatory agitator. What is it, what is in it, that it should possess the imagination of the time?

An arbiter is one who goes to see the matter in hand, hence an examiner or judge. Arbitrators are chosen by opposite parties in dispute to decide the difference. Two parties of arbitrators choose the final referee,—an umpire or odd-numbered arbitrator. Arbitrary and arbitrariness mean either capriciousness or despotism, will inspired by fancy or will absolute. Here the judicial essence is inverted, and becomes the desire of the disputant converted into irresistible force. Note the Knights of Labor development. A grievance exists. Call Knights of Labor to arbitrate it; the order is offended; a strike and stoppage of industry; destruction of property, violence, perhaps murder. If arbitration is to be the court of judicature of the coming generation, if the will of employer and the passions of

Hosted by Google

employed are to be subjected to courts whose decrees shall be stronger than the common law, then society has something yet to learn. Order must be established before any court can sit, and established much more thoroughly, for a court of arbitration.

There have been efforts and tinkering by legislatures, but nothing like arbitration in its true sense, in this country. Conciliation in the form of arbitration has been effected in a few instances,— notably by Straiton and Storms, cigar manufacturers of New York, and by Mr. Washburne, among shoe manufacturers in Philadelphia. But a general submission of disputants to an even serene justice is far away from our present mood.

I assume that labor associations are permanent. That workingmen will cast themselves into one great Asiatic despotism, like the Knights of Labor,—this seems hardly conceivable. Or that they will federate in local and special assemblies, more like the English trades-unions. Either mode involves stronger and stronger combinations of employers for resistance. The strike is here, and well known. The lock-out has hardly begun, especially in our older communities. These combatants will be supported by you. Did labor *qua* labor create you? You hold the supplies, and finally recruit both Capital and Labor. Wisdom is shy and rare: we cannot expect much from her; but exhaustion and prostration may bring a desire for peace, and arbitration may accomplish itself. I think Mr. Weeks — the most experienced student of this subject — is correct, when he says the future arbitration must be voluntary, and not enforced by legislation. Legal or State arbitration has succeeded in France and Belgium. For that reason, it is not likely to succeed in a community differing so much as ours.

I have cast the thoughts suggested by this study into several propositions, as follows: —

I. Arbitration proper begins after all methods of conciliation, by conference or by negotiation of grievances, have been exhausted. Arbitration is a submission of the will of both parties to judges, disinterested and beyond the pale of dispute.

II. Arbitration implies an organized industrial system. The employers must be associated in fact or in sympathetic accord. The employed must be banded together, acting under trained leaders, trusted from long experience. The sanction would come from the deliberate action of these representative bodies, supported by the larger judgment of the whole people. Arbitration would be through a joint board, selected equally from disinterested representatives of employers and employed. The board would choose an umpire, and a decision of the majority must be binding on the disputants.

III. No strike, lock-out, or any suspension of work can be permitted while arbitration is pending.

IV. The right of employers to hire and discharge must be conceded.

V. No interference with employers or employed, by individual or joint action, by boycott, employers' black list, or violence of any kind, can be permitted by any of the parties to systematic arbitration.

Hosted by Google

VI. Voluntary agreement to submit to arbitration, backed by industrial sentiment and confirmed by public sentiment, will be a more effective sanction than any legislation.

It is easy to criticise these propositions, to show that they are impracticable under present conditions. It is as easy to prove that no progress is possible until workingmen and the general public shall be educated and disciplined enough to make some similar system effective. You may or may not like employers and capitalists, the present trustees of industry. You will not better them until you lift the whole constituency into a larger sense of law and order. No arbitration, no co-operation or profit-sharing, can be administered until labor agitators and workingmen are forced — yea, compelled — to see that they must respect the rights of others. Here is the key to the whole problem. The principle has been worked out politically. The State has enlarged its basis until it rests securely on the rights of all. It is for you and those like you to apply the principle to the industrial and social system which underlies the State. We washed our land in blood to right the slave. Have we not force enough, moral and physical, to protect the "scab" and "knobstick," with the victim of the boycott?

I do not argue with workingmen or labor agitators. They have their own modes of discussion. The matter is at the bar of public opinion. My question is with society as a whole. Preachers, publicists, politicians, and speculative thinkers have encouraged, by various means, the agitation in our country, until it has culminated in the organization known as the Knights of Labor. It is time that they show cause why. The consequence is on you, the issue is yours. You have to deal, not with a body of men and women in their capacity of citizens of the United States, but with a horde banded for one arbitrary purpose. This horde is not moved by the genius of a Timur or a Gengis. It is directed by the ferocity of an Irons, and animated by the feeble sentiment of a Powderly. Remand these disturbers of the public peace to the ranks of the people. Then arbitration and other forms of public order will be made easy, by the people and for the people.

Hosted by Google

THE PRESENT ACTUAL CONDITION OF THE WORKINGMAN.

BY CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

TWO VERY pernicious statements have become familiar to the public. One is that social and industrial progress and poverty grow side by side. This statement has been emphasized by Henry George, in his work entitled *Progress and Poverty;* and his followers, in recognizing the truth which lies in Mr. George's statement, accept the letter of his statement, and conclude that progress means poverty, or, in other words, that poverty would not exist to any great extent if the progress of the world did not necessitate it.

The other statement is that the rich are growing richer, and the poor poorer. There is truth in this statement also; and yet it is pernicious, because without analysis it means, or is taken to mean, that because of great riches there must be great poverty.

These two statements have been most freely used during the current decade by writers and speakers of the anarchist and socialistic schools in their attempts to show that the workingman (you will pardon me for the use of the term, but none other is so convenient), the man who works with his hands, and with the skill and brain necessary to guide his hands, is in a worse condition than ever before. What is meant by "ever before" I have not been able to determine.

The indictment which is brought against society has so many counts in it based on actual fact and which come within every one's observation that timid persons and those who have not carefully examined the growth of civilization really believe that the social and moral conditions, as well as the physical environment, of those who earn a living through manual labor are really deplorable; and yet, if the truth in the two statements referred to is recognized, the baneful effects of every other meaning carried by them are removed, and it is seen that the actual condition of this body is on such a high plane that it is an impertinence to attempt to show the better condition as compared with that of the past, and one should beg the pardon of an intelligent audience for offering proofs in this matter. Such a course is justifiable at the present time, however, because of the predominance of strikes and the continual controversies of the industrial world. Statistically speaking, a mass of facts exists, which need only be referred to as bearing upon this matter; and yet the statistician is largely responsible for the influence on society of the doctrine that conditions are growing worse instead of better.

Hosted by Google

Two very distinguished English writers have recently published works which have been extensively quoted in this connection, but usually without a true understanding of the works themselves. Prof. J. E. T. Rogers, late Professor of Political Economy at Oxford, England, and now a member of Parliament, a man of undoubted integrity, great ability, having the courage to say things which would not receive the indorsement of his school, has published a work entitled *Six Centuries of Work and Wages.* The facts brought out by Prof. Rogers relate almost entirely to agricultural labor, and the impression is often left on one's mind, in examining his interesting treatment, that the agricultural laborer of England has not that easy physiological contentment which belonged to his class generations and even centuries ago; but this is because of the cheapness of some provisions in the past as compared with their cost at the present time, and of the fact of the existence of the yeomanry, a class now extinct, but which formed the progressive link between the lower and upper classes of England. Other minor facts, graphically brought out by the author, serve to strengthen the impression left by those referred to; yet Prof. Rogers does not prove nor attempt to prove that the laborer of to-day is in a worse condition than of old, but he does help to show the truth that lies within the two statements with which I have introduced these remarks. *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* must be taken as the chief publication in its line by any author or of any country, and the fearlessness of its author is a guarantee of the integrity of the work.

The other English work referred to is that of Dr. Robert Giffen, the Chief Statistician of the Board of Trade, and late President of the London Statistical Society, a Scotchman of great ability, thorough integrity, and who puts great labor into everything he undertakes. His little work, entitled *The Progress of the Working Classes during the Past Fifty Years*, is quoted by every one who undertakes to refute the idea of retrogression. Dr. Giffen brings an array of data which may be criticised, but which cannot be destroyed. His work is less pretentious, of course, than that of Prof. Rogers, but no less meritorious and influential. An older work in England is that entitled Wade's *History of the Working Classes*, a book replete with historical illustrations and statistics drawn from a wide field of study.

In this country, but little has been done to show the condition of the workingman of the present day in comparison with his condition in the past, beyond fugitive articles, lectures, and speeches. Two works, however, may be referred to: one by my distinguished predecessor in office, Gen. Henry K. Oliver, in the history of labor contained in the First Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor; and the other entitled "Historical Review of Wages and Prices," in the Sixteenth Annual Report of the same Bureau, this review taking up the subject in this country since 1752.* These, with perhaps the addition of Prof. Rogers' earlier work, on the *History of Agricultural Wages and*

* See also *Report on Wages and Prices*, United States Tenth Census, by Joseph D. Weeks, and various papers by Edward Atkinson.

Hosted by Google

Prices, give a mass of details sufficient for quite extended study into the present actual condition of the workingman; and to my own mind there is but one conclusion to be reached by the study, and that is that such condition is vastly better than at any time during the history of the wage system, and that the condition of labor to-day, under such system, is no more to be compared with the condition of labor which preceded it than is the condition of freedom to be compared with that of slavery. In fact, the household comforts and conveniences possessed by the workingman to-day are so far beyond what the workingman had even in the first quarter of this century, and the educational and social privileges now free to him give him such wide opportunities of self-culture and enjoyment, that it is apparent that the difference in all conditions between the employers and their laborers of earlier periods was far less, great as it was, than those between the workman of to-day and his predecessor. The poorest man to-day, so far as labor is concerned, is far better off than were the best conditioned in the olden time.

You ask, then, what grain of truth is there in the idea that progress necessitates poverty, and that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer,—statements which I have called pernicious. I cannot better prove the advance in the condition of labor to-day, as compared with that of the past, than by showing this truth.

You must remember that these two ideas are accepted without a particle of salt, where they are accepted at all. You must remember, also, that the workingman finds himself confronted with great abuses, that he is striving constantly to attain a higher and a better condition, that his struggle irritates and often aggravates him; and this is so true that I have heard men, employers of labor, but on a small scale,—men who had not met with the success accorded to some of their neighbors,—ask the old question, why should they be poor and others rich. I never yet have heard a man ask, however, why others were still poorer than himself, yet the answer of the one question would answer the other; but it is because of the struggle, because of the upward trend of civilization, that the question is asked and that the two statements are accepted as true.

The feudal system of labor preceded the general adoption of the wage system. The condition of labor then, under the earlier system, becomes interesting in the analysis of the progress and poverty idea. This condition is well illustrated by Paul Lacombe, in speaking of France at the opening of the tenth century. He says: "No epoch was ever more frightful for the poor peasant: with no hope, since he had no land and had no chance of becoming rich; with no comforts or even necessaries of existence, life was to him a perpetual agony. We must understand that around the castle of each feudal lord was generally a large palisaded enclosure, built to receive the serfs of the domain and their cattle at the approach of the enemy. To live in his hut like a hare in his hollow, with his ear always on the alert; to cultivate out of season and against his will barren soil; at the slightest sound of danger, to take refuge in the manorial

Hosted by Google

enclosure; to camp there in want and fear, hardly sheltered and not at all fed, a prey to epidemic diseases; . . . to go out starved and trembling, to see his plot of land and his harvest in cinders; to repair the damage and begin again, with the prospect of another similar catastrophe,— such was the life of a peasant under the feudal system of France. The poor creatures felt it an impossibility that humanity could survive under such a system; and, as the year 1000 approached, the opinion spread and became fixed that the first hour of a new century, marked by a prophetic cipher, would be the last of humanity." And this condition continued, not only in France, but in England, the result usually being seen in the vast herds of thieves, robbers, and vagrants that desolated the land; for even in the time of Henry VIII., and during the course of his reign of thirty-eight years, no fewer than seventy-two thousand persons were executed. History has not begun to tell the story of the sufferings of labor prior to the advent of the modern industrial system. All were in misery, with the exception of the few who constituted the families of the feudal lords. The conditions were abject. Pauperism was unknown, to be sure, because all were in poverty. Pauperism, therefore, did not attract legislation, and these conditions existed until progress made pauperism the disgrace of nations; and then, and not till then, pauperism began to be recognized as a condition which should be relieved through legislation. Intellectual growth began to have some influence; for we find among the statutes of England a law passed against laborers during the worst days of her feudal labor, upon complaint of lords and commons, and men of the Holy Church, that "they do come there in great routs and agree by confederacy that every one shall aid every other to resist their lords with strong hands. And so they seemed, partly by law and partly by force, to resist all claims due of their bodies and of them as land-tenants." These efforts probably constituted the first strikes for industrial progress in history. They were contemporaneous with those great upheavals on the continent which are traced through the Anabaptist revolt and along up to the revolution of '89, when the French nation sought to rid itself of the lingering burdens of feudalism; but it was through all these efforts in the great countries of Western Europe that the distinguishing features between prosperity and poverty became prominent. The poverty under the progress of the new order of things was no more intense, no severer, than under the old; but, under the new, it was observable.

I presume Patagonia is quite free from pauperism, in the sense of the word under civilization; but carry industry to Patagonia, employ three-ourths of its inhabitants, give them a taste of education, of civilization, make them feel the power of moral forces even to a slight degree, and the misery of the other fourth can be gauged by the progress of the three-fourths. And a class of paupers would not arise, but would be observed; and one would be truthful in saying that the pauper class in Patagonia became prominent as progress brought the country into a higher state of civilization. And this is why there is a grain of truth in the idea so freely

Hosted by Google

bandied about at the present time, and which, I am sorry to say, has gained so great a lodgement in the public mind in certain directions,— that progress necessitates poverty. The statement itself is perniciously and absolutely false. The history of the origin of the statement shows some truth.

We have in our own day a most emphatic illustration of this in the emancipation of slaves in this country. Under the old system, the negro slave was physically comfortable, as a rule. He was cared for: he was nursed in sickness, fed and clothed, and in old age his physical comforts were continued. He had no responsibility, and, indeed, exercised no skill beyond what was taught him. To eat, work, and sleep were all that was expected of him; and, unless he had a cruel master, he lived the life that belongs to the animal. Since his emancipation and his endowment with citizenship, he has been obliged to support himself and his family, and to contend with all obstacles belonging to a person in freedom. Under the system of villeinage in the old country, it could not be said that there were any general poor, for the master and the lord of the manor took care of the laborers their whole lives; and in our Southern towns, during slavery, this was true, so that in the South there were few, if any, poorhouses. The South to-day knows what pauperism is, as England learned when the system of villeinage departed. The Southern prisons have become active, and all that belongs to the defective, the dependent, and the delinquent classes has come to be familiar to the South; but is there a man of intelligence, of sound reasoning faculties, who would dare stand before this audience, and say that the negro had better go back into slavery, and that the slave system of labor in the South had better be reinstated?

It is by comparison we judge all things, and under higher conditions we become cognizant of the misery attending lower conditions. In fact, it is only by intelligence, only by higher civilization, that we recognize misery at all; and when we step out of the bad condition, when we know enough to cling to the good things of life, we can understand this. We then live in a light never before granted us.

Almost the same analysis might be applied to the other statement, that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer. This statement would be true in every respect if aggregate wealth remained stationary while populations increased, if under such stationary wealth and increase of population a few men could grow wealthy. But the wealth of to-day cannot be compared with the wealth of the past, any more than agricultural conditions of to-day can be compared with those of the past. Gold and silver were formerly the products of the hardest manual labor: to-day, they are more nearly allied to the products of manufacturing, the mining of ore being carried on with machinery and power. The farm of to-day is not the farm of a generation ago. The agriculturist of the East does not compete with the agriculturist of the West. In the East, the man who still likes to call himself a farmer does some farming; but he does many other things, still working his soil, to be sure, which takes him out of the old

Hosted by Google

designation. In the West, a great farmer is a manufacturer. Hundreds and thousands of acres cannot be cultivated on the farmer basis, but on that of manufacturing and of the great producer. The individual methods of making things have passed away, and goods are made under the management of great establishments of aggregated industry. Aggregation is the rule of the industrial world in every direction. Wealth, under such conditions, becomes a factor in production. The implements of industry are rarely owned by the man who uses them. All the latter wants of them is their use, and the opportunities to use them. Through modern conditions and the power of aggregation, some men have become wealthier than any other men in the past; also, more men have had a share in the increasing wealth in proportion to the number of men who had a share in the aggregate wealth of older days. As wealth has become diffused, intellectual power has increased. As mental activity has become necessary to the accumulation of wealth, the man without a requisite amount of mental vitacity has been left in the race; and, while he has not become poorer than ever before, he seems poorer than his successful competitors. In the more general diffusion of wealth, of the comforts and of the luxuries of life, the man who gets the least share in such diffusion becomes noticeable by comparison, and sensitive, too; and this constitutes the grain of truth in the statement that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer. The poor man of the past was a clod, and to bring him into association with the poor man of the present is an insult to the citizen of to-day.

My respect and admiration for the producers working under our modern industrial system — men of skill, bright, intelligent citizens — prevent me from bringing them into comparison with the clods who sullenly performed their work under the old system. I am perfectly well aware that here and there in any country there can be found dens and hovels in which men and families devoted to industrial pursuits find what they call their homes. I have seen such. I can find them in my own State, and probably in every State in the Union. I can find them in England, and in every continental country. But they are the exceptions. In Manchester, England, fifty years ago, sixty thousand factory operatives were living underground in cellarages. To-day, you cannot find one family belonging to the industrial classes living in such a hole. I have looked into a thousand homes of the working people of Europe; I do not know how many in this country. I have tried to find the best and the worst. And while, as I say, I am aware that the worst exists, and as bad as under any system or as bad as in any age, I have never had to look beyond the inmates to find the cause; and in every case, so far as my own observation goes, drunkenness was at the bottom of the misery, and not the industrial system or the industrial conditions surrounding the men and their families.

To-day, the whole matter of the consideration of the condition of the workingman becomes intellectual. He is carried onward and upward by the power of mental activity, and cannot be treated separately as one of a class, as he could in the olden time, because in the olden time he was

Hosted by Google

neither a social nor a political factor. Changed conditions in all directions have brought mankind to a new epoch, the distinguishing feature of which is machinery. Machinery is the type and representative of the civilization of this period, because it embodies, so far as mechanics are concerned, the concentrated, clearly wrought out thought of the age. Books convey thought: machinery is its embodiment. The workingman, like all men, is living in the age of mind, intellect, and brain, the trinity which to-day rules and is king; and machinery, in the industrial world, is the king's prime minister. Wealth of mind and wealth of purse must struggle for the mastery; but the former will win, does win, and gives the crown to inventive genius. It is natural and logical that under such sovereignty machinery should not only typify the progress of the race, but have a clearly marked influence upon the morals of the people,— a mixed influence, too, like every other power; for men are what we call good or evil, but, on the whole, with the good vastly predominating. As mind developed machinery primarily, so machinery develops mental activity. The mind expands in its presence. This thought has been well expressed in verse by Byron, in his description of a church in "Childe Harold": only, I will apply it to one viewing for the first time some mechanical achievement, the famous Corliss engine, for instance: —

> "Enter; its grandeur overwhelms thee not;
> And why? It is not lessened, but thy mind,
> Expanded by the genius of the spot,
> Has grown colossal."

With machinery and the mental activity belonging to it came the discussions and agitations for the amelioration of the condition of operatives, resulting in less hours, the guarding of machinery, and all the beneficent laws for the elevation of the British factory operatives to the plane of men and women. The constant promotion of luxuries to the grade of necessaries of life, a course which marks the forward steps of civilization, and which positively demands the fullest play of the ingenuity of man to place them within reach, has been made easy and certain through the new order of things. Machinery, and the division of labor, as a secondary mental result, have brought positive reduction in working time and corresponding increase in wages. Wider benefits can be traced to the same cause, among them the increased chance of life, which during the past century has been raised ten per cent.; in the fourfold increase of productive power, and the ability on the part of the common man to command what rulers, with all the appointments of war and the adjuncts of unlimited exchequers, could not command. The individual, as well as his kind, profits by the reward of improved conditions. In this age, one can hardly realize that there should have been a time in Europe when a linen sheet cost thirty-two days' labor, and a gridiron from four to twelve days; and when the halls of baronial castles were strewn with rushes for carpets, and royal ladies used their gowns for bed-coverings, and noble revellers sat on rude benches of wood, picking their food with their fingers from the dishes; and when cities were

Hosted by Google

crumbling into ruins and farm laborers lived in mud hovels without chimneys; when every man carried around his own knife to eat with, and one or two drinking-cups sufficed for the household; when most of the clothing was leather, and the food of the rich was limited to a very small number of articles. As odd as these strange conditions seem to us to-day, when brought to mind, they strike with less marvel than the reflection that Cyrus, when he had turned the river Euphrates from its channel, and captured by his strategy the city of Babylon, could inform his associates at home of his success as quickly as could Washington inform the American Congress of the defeat of Cornwallis; or that Alexander, after Arbela, could send the news of his great victory for civilization to his capital in the same time it took Jackson to inform the Government of the United States that New Orleans had ratified the treaty of peace.

It has been reserved for this period, our period, for the age of machinery, of mental growth and expansion, to conquer the great difficulties in the way of national movements which beset the governments existing back of this period. The great reward of nations has been fully shared by the individual; for, while to create is the privilege of the omnipotent, the second great attribute is to devolop, and this has allied man to the Creator. From a rude instrument of toil, he has become an intelligent exponent of hidden laws. Intelligence, skill, and labor, with their products of mind, have accomplished this alliance, and to such an extent that it is a mooted question whether the individual or the State has been the greater sharer in the development. The individual has learned one grand truth,— and that is, that he is not an animal; that he is something more; that he wants not the contentment of animal life,— a contentment which he knows now is simply "the virtue of the subjects of a despotically governed and non-progressive state"; and, further, that the self-denial which belonged to the clod of the olden time is simply "the virtue of a poor and unprosperous people." And he has learned, too, that the ranks of the skilled and intelligent workmen are not thinned by the workhouse and penitentiary, but that the ranks of ignorant labor furnish the most prolific source for stocking such institutions. He has learned, or he should learn, that the sacredness of private property lies in the fundamental principle or instinct of self-preservation,— in fact, that private property finds its institution in this instinct; for property is the means by which not only is self preserved, but by which species may be perpetuated.

Phillips Bevan, of England, writing in 1877 of the industrial classes of his country, remarked that "few people are aware of the immense development of the last twenty-five years found in the condition for the better of English operatives especially, whether in a monetary, social, educational, sanitary, or legislative light. It is very doubtful whether the bulk of the workingmen themselves take heed of the strides they have made or of how little they have to lament that the 'good old times' are past and gone." What a commentary is this hardly won development upon the fantastical and pernicious sentiment with which a pessimistic set of teachers call up

Hosted by Google

ages and conditions from which it is the greatest of blessings that we have been wholly delivered!

In art directions, the development has been as great as in the purely mechanical field; for, by the aid of mechanical powers, the work of our artisans is rapidly making the taste of all the people artistic, for trained and inventive skill, as exhibited in machinery, puts art into wood and metal, showing "the highest discipline of the mental faculties, the direction and the subordination of all its manifestations for some clearly defined purpose." Every step marks some progress in industrial art. The stove manufacturer, in order to meet the demands of the common people in the production of his goods, must secure the services of an artist, that the design of the kitchen or the parlor stove shall not offend the artistic eye.

The ethical influence of the more modern system has been marked indeed, and especially in our own country; for the American workman is not a Sabbath breaker. He takes his children to the Sunday-school as well as to the day school. He demands, as a necessity, the culture to be gained by reading, music, and the lyceum; and, from his moral and educational stand-point, he participates in the government, and has raised from his ranks some of our very best and most revered chief magistrates, State and National. And he will demand in the future general admission to the ranks of the aristocracy of mind, where his name now occupies so bright a place.

The development has reached the economic side of industry; and this economic side, as it is better understood by our workingmen, will bring about truer and happier industrial relations. At present, the manufacturing world is disturbed by a succession of strikes and labor controversies. Do not, I beg you, make the mistake of assigning the cause of such strikes and controversies to retrogression or to supposed increasing antagonism, or to any socialistic desire to destroy or in any way abridge the grand results of the past developments. On the other hand, think for a moment that the man who works for wages has been taught to realize the conditions of a higher civilization; has been taught to appreciate, understand, and desire still greater mental, moral, and social progress. He has been taught to enjoy art and music and literature, to understand that he is one of the sovereigns of the land, that he is a political and a moral factor; and, with all this, he finds he still keeps the position of a wage receiver in enterprises in which his skill, as well as his hand, is a necessity. The honest and the intelligent workman, so far as he is engaged in the controversies of the day, is the conservator of all the required forces of industry; but he seeks, in this conservation to become more closely allied to the factor of capital, which without him is dead material. He begins to see that, while he has outgrown the purely physiological relation which labor bears to production, — that is, the position of the animal,— he furnishes the developed mental qualities of the man; and, seeing this, he sees that he vitalizes the material side of production, which is capital. He therefore asks that he may become more closely associated with capital in the great productive enter-

Hosted by Google

prises of the day. How a new system shall be established, with perfect justice to capital and to labor, recognizing the moral forces at work contemporaneously with the industrial, is the problem of the age. I feel so sure that this problem will be solved on the broadest business basis, through the practical application of the moral principles of co-operative work, that I have little anxiety for the industrial future of the country. I know no one element can come in as a panacea for ills; but I feel morally certain that a combination of elements can be so applied, and will be so applied, as to relieve industry of the present apparent warfare. Progress has been so rapid that we fail to see the intelligence underlying the industrial controversies. Ignorance of the conditions of production, narrow minds on all sides, greed, selfishness, and perhaps dishonesty, are all interwoven with intelligence, and sometimes so closely that it seems as if the unhappy conditions subordinated those of intelligence. Mechanical development has reached such a point that some of our writers have had the courage to declare that we have arrived at the end of the *régime* of machinery. So, indeed, we have; but it is the first end, and not the end they would have it, which to them means retrogression. The development must go on. The future of the achievement of inventive genius in the mechanical, chemical, and other sciences is bright indeed, and holds out to humanity its best boons and most munificent endowments, not only in moral and industrial directions, but in a better and a greater and a more equal diffusion of wealth and all that wealth means. Machinery is young; in fact, is only the forerunner, the Messiah, of great, undiscovered wonders, which will make the inventions of the past seem like toys thrown away as childhood steps into humanity through growth, through strength, and through perfection, which in itself is weakness as compared with the perfection of the invisible power, the manifestation of whose presence constantly reminds us that the future holds the golden age, and not the past.

I have referred to Gen. Oliver, a man whose saintly soul brought him to look at all things with great warmth of sympathy for the toilers of the land. I cannot use better language in closing than to repeat what he said when speaking of the influences which are now brought into the daily life of the great classes of wealth-producers, the artisans of all grades, and which stamp the mark of superiority on the present. The influence of such things, he says, "makes better what is good. It renders purer what is pure: it strengthens strength, lifts up the heart, invigorates the life, and so makes a man abler for his duty, and therefore of more productive energy. Nothing is more true than that if you desire to make a man clean, surround him with cleanliness; if to make him refined, surround him with refinement; if to make him holy, surround him with holiness. If you desire to keep him in heart and in hearty work, surround him with some of the heart-cheering results of his own work, and keep hope in quickened activity to stimulate him to continued successful effort."

Hosted by Google

THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD THE DRAM-SHOP.

BY JUDGE ROBERT C. PITMAN.

THE gospel of Christ was heralded by penitential exhortations and prophetic visions. "Repent ye," was the cry of John the Baptist, "for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." And the Master opened his ministry with the same utterance, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand."

This kingdom was not relegated to another world. Jesus taught his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on *earth* as in heaven"; and his early followers, like the revelator, had visions of the New Jerusalem, the heavenly city, whose builder and maker was God, "coming down out of heaven" to establish itself among men.

The Church of Christ, then, if it stands for anything, stands for the coming of the kingdom of heaven here and now. And the kingdom of heaven clearly is wherever God's children live according to his will. The fullest development of all their faculties is the highest manifestation of his glory. The importance of any good agency, the magnitude of any evil, is gauged by its effect upon this. We believe the temperance reform to be the largest and broadest of all the humane movements of the age, because we believe it most vitally affects the spiritual condition of the masses. We believe, with Sir Charles Buxton, that "intemperance is the mightiest of the forces that clog the progress of good. It is in vain that every engine is set to work that philanthropy can devise, when those whom we seek to benefit are habitually tampering with their faculties of reason and will, soaking their brains with beer or inflaming them with ardent spirits. The struggle of the school, the library, and the Church, all united, against the beer-house and gin-palace, is but one development of the war between heaven and hell." In that war, the place of the Christian Church is surely in the van.

The dram-shop is the prolific mother of drunkenness; and to combat so vulgar a vice, either in its causes or consequences, is not a fashionable or a pleasing task. The falsely refined shrink from it. In the outset of the slavery discussion, Dr. Channing wrote: "There are not a few persons who, from vulgar modes of thinking, cannot be interested in this subject. Because the slave is a degraded being, they think slavery a low topic, and wonder how it can excite the sympathy of those who can discuss or feel for anything else." Such is the secret thought of many in regard to intemperance. But the noble soul feels the obligation of nobility; and the noblest

Hosted by Google

of all turned from the sublime discourse of the Last Supper to offer that most impressive object-lesson of the washing of the disciples' feet; and all who profess and call themselves Christians must hear his voice ever sounding in their ears: "Ye call me Master and Lord; and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, A servant is not greater than his lord; neither one that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them." And so lowly service became transfigured with the light of heavenly love.

But do not let us imagine that the temperance reform is merely a work of charity. It comes closer to us than that. Modern science and philosophy have made most emphatic to us the declaration of Paul that we are members one of another, and as Matthew Arnold has finely expressed it: "No individual life can be truly prosperous passed in the midst of those who suffer. To the noble soul, it cannot be happy: to the ignoble, it cannot be safe."

I have here paused long to think how, in the time I can give to the task, I can most effectively impress the horrors and dangers of the dram-shop. It is a trite topic. Everybody condemns it in the abstract, however they may tolerate or even support it in the concrete. But to assent to a truth is one thing, and to realize it another. I have long felt the truth of the aphorism of Coleridge, that some truths "are too often considered as so true that they lose all the power of truth, and lie bed-ridden in the dormitory of the soul side by side with the most despised and exploded errors."

If, now, I open this Pandora's box of the dram-shop, shall I attempt to catalogue its evils? That were a wearisome overpowering task. But upon what principle shall I make my selection? We know that alcohol is a double poison,— that it poisons the body and poisons the soul, that it robs us of the things temporal and the things eternal, and that, as a body of Christian churches, our concern is mainly with the latter. But our religion looks with a benignant eye upon every interest of humanity; and our liberal Christianity especially sees the eternal in the temporal, the things of the spirit in the flesh, and notes the interactions and manifold relations of the world without us to the world within. So we cannot draw any hard and fast line between the sacred and the secular.

Indeed, when we consider how powerful a factor environment is in the formation of character, we can hardly overestimate the evil influence of intemperance in this direction, if we confine ourselves only to its effect upon the external condition of its victims. Disease, poverty, pauperism, are moral as well as physical perils. The drunkard's home, if it be not a desecration to apply that sacred name to the place where he sleeps away his debauch, is a *nidus* not only of suffering, but of depravity,— a

Hosted by Google

suffering and a depravity too often shared by all who dwell under his roof. Even the matter of a decent dwelling is almost essential to a decent life.

But the direct influence of intemperance in the work of moral degradation, if not more certain than the indirect, is perhaps more obvious. The dram-shop looms up before the public eye the most impressively as the great manufactory of crime. The testimony of judges, of prosecuting officers, of keepers and chaplains of prisons, and of boards of inspection, both in England and in this country, is uniform and overwhelming. The present Chief Justice of England, Lord Coleridge, voices it all when he says, "Judges are weary of calling attention to drink as the principal cause of crime; but I cannot refrain from saying that, if they could make England sober, they would shut up nine-tenths of the prisons." But to some minds, perhaps, the most conclusive demonstration of the potency of intemperance as the generator of crime will be found in the Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics for 1881. The investigation was under the direction of Carroll D. Wright, who has now a national reputation as a statistician. "The logic," says Col. Wright, "which the temperance advocate stands most in need of is the solid strength of facts, collected and collated in a thorough and systematic manner within limits circumscribed as to time and territory." Accordingly, the County of Suffolk (which includes the city of Boston) was selected for the field of investigation; and, in each of the courts of criminal jurisdiction, a paid agent was employed for the year, with instructions to "interview each criminal separately, to hear his statements as to the points of inquiry, to follow the evidence in each case in court, and to acquaint themselves, as far as practicable, with the circumstances connected with the past life of each criminal." The results are given in a variety of tables; and, stated briefly, it appears that there was a total of eighty-four per cent. of all crime due directly or indirectly to the influence of liquor.

Considered alone, therefore, as a generator of crime, the suppression of the dram-shop is one of the most imminent demands alike of statesmanship, philanthropy, and of religion. But my thought goes beyond this mass of outward crime. Sad as that is, it represents but a part of the spiritual debasement which the liquor traffic causes to human life. Back of action is character, and what a man is is more important even than what he does. Alcohol, it is true, leads to crime in a double way by its malignant action upon the brain. It throws off the restraints of caution and fear; and it excites the lower and animal passions, while it deadens the higher faculties. The destruction of the moral equilibrium of character and the sensualizing of the nature are the more important and permanent effect of alcoholic indulgence, and this effect is produced far short of the stage of actual drunkenness. The impairment of spiritual force as well as of mental and physical from the drinking habit is incalculable. But the end is not here.

Hosted by Google

The curse of alcohol ends not with death. From the earliest times, the transmissibility of it has been observed. Thus, it was a saying of Aristotle that "drunken women bring forth children like unto themselves"; and Plutarch declares that "one drunkard begets another." But it has been reserved for the men of science of this generation to unfold the exactness, the universality, and the far-reaching extent of the law of heredity. "All the diseases," says Darwin, "arising from drinking spirituous and fermented liquors are liable to become hereditary, even to the third generation, increasing, if the cause be continued, till the family becomes extinct." Says Dr. Ray, one of the first American authorities on the subject of insanity, "Another potent agency in vitiating the quality of the brain is habitual intemperance, and the effect is far oftener witnessed in the offspring than in the drunkard himself." And Dr. Anstie notes that "many drinkers who were never drunk have yet transmitted very unstable nervous systems to their children." If there were time, I could add to these citations the testimony of such experts as Magnus Huss, Morell, Dr. Carpenter, Dr. Maudsley, Dr. Richardson, and our own Dr. Jarvis. The whole subject is impressively discussed by the State Board of Charities of Massachusetts (of which Dr. S. G. Howe and Dr. Nathan Allen were members) in their Second Annual Report; and, in conclusion, they say: —

> The facts and considerations just named make clear the sad truth that the children of parents whose systems were tainted by alcoholic poison do start in life under great disadvantage. While they inherit strong animal propensities and morbid appetites and tendencies constantly craving indulgence, they have weak restraining faculties. Their temptation is greater, and their power of resistance is less, than in children of purer stock. They are, therefore, more likely to fall into the pauper or criminal class.

There are two other pregnant suggestions in this able paper, which might be fortified by other authorities. One is that the constitutional effects of distilled and fermented liquors, depending upon their common basis of alcohol, are the same; and the other, that tippling is worse than occasional drunkenness in its effect upon offspring.

The indictment against the dram-shop contains many other counts; but, if this of soul murder — the ruin of the soul in the father and then in the son — is sustained, what need of further accusation? An institution that vitiates human stock is surely the most terrible foe of civilization, and the most deadly antagonist of the kingdom of God. It is the old allegory of the devil and the angel contending for the soul of man, only intensified; for it is not for the possession of a single soul, but of the human race.

Against the dram-shop, then, the Christian Church must wage unflinching and uncompromising war. The political economist may denounce it as the shameful waster of the public wealth, the statesman as the overshadowing peril of our popular institutions, the reformer as the huge obstacle which blocks all the paths of human progress, and the philanthropist because it causes untold misery to its victims; but the Christian

Hosted by Google

Church, besides and beyond all these reasons, because it degrades and debases human nature itself, and blots out the divine image from the soul of man.

And, now, how shall it fight this Demon? First, let it seek to cut off its supplies. If there were no drinkers, it is a truism that there would be no dram-shop. If I address any "moderate drinker," I will not stop here and now to argue with him the point of danger, or to press upon him my clear conviction that, aside from that, if he follows the foremost man in our liberal Church and easily the first of English metaphysicians, Dr. James Martineau (who at sixty threw away the glass of wine his physician recommended as a daily beverage), he will share his experience of the direct refreshment and satisfaction in the simpler modes of life, and join with him in the expressed belief that "few things do more, at a minimum of cost, to lighten the spirits and sweeten the temper of families and of society than the repudiation of artificial indulgences." But I will urge the moderate drinker to surrender his luxury, that he may have influence (to use the tender phrase of the great Apostle to the Gentiles) over "the weaker brother for whom Christ died," and that he may stand where he can do valiant work in this "battle between heaven and hell." If there *is* any self-denial in the surrender, it is a denial of the lower self which enriches the higher,— a putting aside a sensual indulgence for the uplifting of a brother,— which, if there is any truth in religion or any reliance upon the experience of noble souls, brings its own "exceeding great reward."

Next, the whole force of its moral condemnation must be brought by the Church to bear against the dram-shop, its patrons, supporters, and allies. In the Protestant world, the pulpit is the principal voice of the Church; and its tone should not only be unmistakable, but courageous and emphatic. There is always a grave question to what extent the pulpit should deal with practical affairs, with what may be called applied Christianity. And I am willing to grant this much to the conservative: that the primary function of the pulpit is the awakening of the spiritual life and the unsealing of that fountain from whence all good actions do proceed. There is always danger when the pulpit attempts to teach concrete ethics in the complex affairs of human life,— the double danger of neglecting that which no one else is set to do, and of attempting that which others can do better. But still, in a matter so clear and of so overshadowing importance as the suppression of the dram-shop, I must think that pulpit is false to its trust which never utters either a word of solemn warning against the seductions of the intoxicating cup or the national peril of the saloon. There may be other places better adapted for reiterated exhortation or practical teaching, but the pulpit has a clear duty to define its position. It yet carries with it a great moral power; and, to many minds, what it does not denounce it practically sanctions. We are apt to underestimate the negative influence of silence, when great moral questions are at the front.

Hosted by Google

May I venture one remark further? I have sometimes thought that our modern Unitarian pulpit, with all its "sweetness and light," lacked sternness and strength in its treatment of both sin and sinners. The "Great Denunciation," as Farrar styles it, has its legitimate place in the life of the Master, and goes with the gentler pictures of his life to make up the ideal humanity. A religion without moral indignation is not suited to this world, if, indeed, it be to any. Vice is not a differentiation of virtue, but heaven and hell rightly typify their infinite separation. And Montaigne, in his homely way, tells us an important truth, when he says that "on the sustaining of a high tone of moral feeling, by giving harsh names to harsh deeds, the preservation of the boundaries between virtue and vice largely depends."

Rich and conservative churches need to remember the historic lesson taught by the anti-slavery conflict. It is startling to look back and see how long and to what an extent the conscience of the Church could be stifled on a great moral question, especially when it assumed a concrete form. Slaveholders were among the scribes and Pharisees of every fashionable sect, and it was preposterous that such men should be denounced by vagrant enthusiasts. The Southern people were gentlemen and the most gracious of hosts. Were they to be denounced by ill-mannered fanatics? The prophets were better put out of the synagogue. And so conservatism in the pews begat conservatism in the pulpits. Slavery made Presidents, and continued to be respectable. Meantime, not only did a great cause, the greatest of the century, lack its natural leaders, but religion itself, the religion of the churches, grew unreal and pusillanimous, losing the respect of the world and its own manly courage. For it is ever true, as has been well said by President Bascom: —

> An easy-going religion that takes things as it finds them may be worth something. I know not exactly how much it is worth. I cannot weigh the small remainder of ashes that may be present after destructive distillation. But religion that is to do its work must declare itself in terms of humanity in what it thinks of the evils of the hour, and in their remedy.

And he adds what is specially pertinent: —

> Intemperance is not a mole-hill, but a mountain in the path of human progress What will we do with it? Level it or pitch our camp in despair under its shadow? We can answer no other question to any great purpose till we answer this question.

From a church dead to humanity, the spirit of the Master has fled; and the vision of heavenly truth disappears. A recent writer has said that "Christianity is a restless desire to uplift the race. Buddhism is a contented meditation upon divine things, while the world is left to shift for itself." To which, I should only add that Christianity itself had a meditation upon still diviner things, and that the secret of Jesus — the overpowering sense of the Fatherhood of God — was at once the most

Hosted by Google

comforting, the most revolutionary, and the most constructive of influences in human history. And here, as elsewhere, we only truly know of the doctrine as we live it.

I have spoken of the duty of the pulpit. May I add a word as to the Sunday-school? As formation is better and surer than reformation, we cannot afford to neglect the field of youthful culture until the enemy has sown it with tares. The motherly instinct of the Women's Christian Temperance Union has already secured from many of the States a law requiring scientific instruction on this subject in the public schools. Shall not an enlightened Christian sentiment in our churches take some method to insure an effective presentation of its moral and religious aspects in our Sunday-schools? Upon many natures, cold scientific truth may make little impression; but their hearts may be open to the tender touch of womanly love or the impressive counsels of manly wisdom which come from the teaching of those who are not compelled by statute law, but impelled by that personal philanthropy which makes them true children of the great "Lover of Souls."

But, as liberal Christians, we must not forget that our main duties as members of the great body of Christian people are outside of ecclesiastical institutions, and cannot be remitted to the clergy. It is not enough that the pulpit does its duty, nor that the pews help and not hinder it in the doing. When moral teaching and moral suasion have done their work, what remains as the duty of the citizen toward the dram-shop?

I answer unhesitatingly, To *exterminate* it, with all its roots and ramifications! The case demands heroic treatment. In the time at my disposal, I cannot attempt any labored argument in favor of prohibition as against license; but I submit to your thoughtful consideration these propositions: —

1. License laws have had their centuries of trial and their centuries of failure.

2. Prohibitory laws require for their truest success a party behind them pledged to their faithful and uniform enforcement; but, without this, the statistics show a uniform reduction of drunkenness and crime, so far as they have been approximately enforced.

3. The observation and judgment of those most vitally interested in the practical work of the temperance reform — as the various reform clubs, the temperance organizations, and the Women's Christian Temperance Union — are almost unanimous in favor of the usefulness of prohibitory laws.

4. The judgment of the "trade" is in the same direction,— that prohibitory laws pinch and curtail them. Surely, they know best what hurts them.

5. License laws have often been repealed for their weakness and inefficiency; prohibitory laws, for their strength in restraint.

6. License laws offend the moral sense of a large part of the community.

Hosted by Google

7. As a species of monopoly, they offend the sense of justice and equality of the average American citizen.

8. License laws teach, as with the authority of the State, that moderate and regulated drinking is safe. Prohibitory laws teach the contrary.

We can hardly overestimate the force of law, in the long run, as a moral teacher. "It is a profound observation," said one of the wisest of our judges, "that the morality of no people can be maintained above the morality of their laws." And it was the remark of one of the wisest students of history, Dr. Arnold of Rugby, that "law and government are the sovereign influence in human society. In the last resort, they shape and control it at their pleasure. Institutions depend on them, and are by them formed and modified. What they sanction will ever be generally considered innocent. What they condemn is thereby made a crime, and, if persisted in, becomes rebellion." As I have elsewhere said, license laws carry to the popular mind the implication that, although the traffic in intoxicants is an exceptional one, requiring some unusual safeguards, yet there is a legitimate public demand for such liquors as an ordinary beverage, which the State is bound to provide for. The correlative of regulation by the State is moderate drinking (or what he imagines to be such) by the individual. On the other hand, prohibitory laws as plainly declare that the sale of intoxicants as a beverage supplies no legitimate want, and is fraught with such dire evils to the State as to justify and require its suppression. What is so dangerous to the State can hardly be deemed safe to the citizen, and the natural sequence of prohibition is total abstinence.

It remains to speak of that system of "high license," as it has been called, lately tried in some of our Western States, and which has been well styled "only a buffer interposed between the liquor traffic and the popular indignation against it." On the side of temperance, the two advantages claimed for this species of license are that it decreases the number of saloons and increases their character. First, as to the alleged decrease. I have before me a mass of variant statistics and statements in regard to this. Taking the most favorable view of the case, the reduction is but slight. But what is most important to observe is that a much greater reduction in the number of places would not necessarily imply any reduction in the amount of drinking. Opportunity and temptation are the liquor-dealers' baits; and, in order to ascertain whether high license will diminish its victims, we must see how it will affect these. We shall be aided by observing how the law of trade works in cases where the desire to obtain commodities is innocent, but in the main artificial or conventional, and so depending also on convenience and allurement.

"Trade," says Emerson, "is a varioloid of cannibalism"; and, in these days, we certainly see the large dealers swallowing the small. The tendency to concentrate fashionable retail trade in our larger cities in a few hands is very marked. Small stores disappear, and their proprietors

Hosted by Google

become salesmen in large houses. But no one supposes, because the monster firms of the metropolis have absorbed scores of small shops, that the aggregate sales of dry goods are less. On the contrary, there is no doubt that the lower prices at which their large capital enables them to buy and sell, the larger variety of stock, and the better opportunity for display create larger sales than ever. There are resisting circumstances which have heretofore checked the tendency for the large groggeries to swallow the smaller; but, if high license *enforced* should drive into destruction or darkness all the small dealers, would there be less drinking? Is it not clear that the facility of obtaining liquor would not be sensibly diminished, while the temptation would be greatly increased? A "gin-palace" would be more dangerous than a gin-den.

And now as to the alleged improvement in the character of the saloon. High license has an attraction for many, because they instinctively assume that an aristocratic saloon is less dangerous than a low dram-shop. But the first will always necessitate and create the latter. And, in point of fact, they co-exist under high license. Thus, in Chicago, where that system has been in effect some three years, a recent grand jury made this presentment: "Having discovered that a majority of the cases of robbery sent to the grand jury by the different police justices of Chicago originated in the low saloons in certain districts of the city, the proprietors of which are licensed to carry on their nefarious business by the city of Chicago and enjoy immunity from the police authorities, a committee of our body was appointed to ascertain if such charges of irregularities and flagrant dereliction of duty on the part of the police force were true. . . . We now regret to report that it is positively known to us that the administration of affairs in the first police district is in a condition of deplorable rottenness. Dives of the lowest order defy the city ordinance by keeping open from dawn until midnight, and from midnight to dawn, wherein congregate disreputable women, thieves, and criminals, well known to the police; and, upon our oaths as jurors, we blush to say that policemen have been seen in full uniform tippling with disreputables in the same dens, long after the midnight hour." So utterly inefficacious has high license proved as a regulator of the traffic. But, after all, we must never forget that the disgusting accessories are not the principal evil of drinking. These are sequences of educational work commenced higher up. It is not the accidents which surround the drink, but the alcohol in it which constitutes the peril. The trouble with tippling is not that it is vulgar, but that it is deadly to body and soul. If it were possible to make it respectable, it were not less, but more, dangerous.

High license has not indeed succeeded in making the saloon respectable, but it has made it powerful. The Chicago *Daily News*, in explaining why the saloons violate all the restrictions of the law with impunity, tells us that "the major number of the successful men in both city and county politics have large slices in saloon estates, and do most of their

Hosted by Google

wire-pulling in the immediate neighborhood of the bar." Also, that eight of the aldermen are saloon-keepers, and two others have been engaged in the business, and on the quiet are still engaged in it. And *Unity* tells us how the public conscience is deadened: —

> In Chicago, the thirty-three hundred saloons will pay $1,650,000 toward police and schools. This operates as an enormous bribe on all tax-payers. It secures the newspapers as aiders and abettors. It is hush-money to the ministers. It tempts every father and mother of boys by paying so much sure benefit in return for harm. Let the system rule undisputed for ten years, and the general conscience would be palsied.

Souls ruined that taxes may be lightened! What a commentary on our civilization!

And, now, I know that some good people will have listened to me with general assent, but with a despair of success in any radical assault upon the dram-shop. It is too dangerous to open battle all along the line; but we must try local skirmishing, and all sorts of half-way measures. Men are appalled at the power of this traffic. To the outward eye, its power is growing. To the American whiskey bar-room has been added the German lager saloon. Its money power is colossal: it is organized and unscrupulous. It has the support of a fierce appetite behind it, and the alliance of every evil power and propensity. It has been able to govern our large cities, largely to subsidize the press, and to bribe or intimidate the great political parties. But, for all this, it is not to be the final victor. Christianity is the religion of courage and of hope. The kingdom of heaven *will* come, and the dram-shop *must* go. Those who listen may even now hear the distant mutterings of the people's indignation, betokening that irresistible earthquake which is to topple the whole system from turret to foundation.

Meantime, I say with one of the most venerated of our leaders, Dr. Eliot, of St. Louis: —

> I am persuaded by careful observation, I am convinced by gospel law, that we must work with clean hands if we would resist this fearful evil successfully. We must stand distinctly upon moral ground if we would work successfully against social iniquity. To license and "regulate" a notoriously pernicious trade,—is it not a respectable kind of moral suicide?

To act nobly here is to act wisely. Success will not attend trimming or compromising. We need a constant appeal to what is best and highest in our nature. We need to remember what is well said by Canon Farrar, —"No deed of permanent greatness, no deed of regenerating force, can be achieved without enthusiasm."

Whatever else we may do without in this great impending fight with the liquor interest, we cannot do without the Cromwellian soldiers who fight for a great cause. We can arouse no enthusiasm for a struggle for terms and restrictions, for a battle whose success is to be a treaty of protection for a licensed monopoly, which, in a respectable way, and ac-

Hosted by Google

cording to law, is to fill our homes with sorrow and our land with evil. We must fight for the kingdom of God, and not for terms with the devil. And, so fighting, we may take to heart the prophetic words of Goldwin Smith: —

> The ultimate issue of the struggle is certain. If any one doubts the general preponderance of good over evil in human nature, he has only to study the history of moral crusades. The enthusiastic energy and self-devotion with which a great moral cause inspires its soldiers always have prevailed, and always will prevail, over any amount of self-interest or material power arrayed on the other side.

Hosted by Google

THE EFFECTS OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES UPON THE HEALTH.

BY FRANCIS MINOT, M.D.

I SUPPOSE there is no class of the community which has more abundant opportunities of observing the effects of alcohol upon the human system than physicians. They are called upon almost daily to prescribe it as a valuable aid to the restoration of health, or to remedy, as far as lies in their power, its disastrous effects when taken in excess. Within the brief limits assigned to me, I can only allude to the most important points of this interesting subject, which I propose to treat under the following heads: —

1. The effect of alcohol in moderate quantities on healthy persons.

2. Its effect, when taken to excess, in predisposing to disease in general and to special diseases, or in modifying the course and events of disease.

3. The causes of alcoholism, or habitual excessive indulgence in alcohol.

4. How far can alcoholism be prevented or cured by medical treatment?

(1) Alcohol, largely diluted, as in the form of wine, malt liquor, cider, etc., appears to have no injurious effect upon the health, unless taken in excessive quantities; nor does it predispose to indulgence in ardent spirits, as is evident from the fact that intemperance is much more rare in wine-growing countries, or in those in which malt liquors are principally drunk, than elsewhere. Taken in small quantities, it increases the gastric secretions and the movements of the stomach, and thus aids digestion. A large number of persons, who are in the possession of average health, find that they can perform their daily tasks with more ease or can accomplish more work by taking a moderate amount of wine or malt liquor. In persons of delicate health, especially children or young persons who are descended from tuberculous parents or ancestors, the use of wine in moderate quantities is sometimes of the greatest benefit. The temperate use of spirit, in the form of brandy, whiskey, etc., by aged persons, is often a valuable means of supporting the strength, of improving the digestion, and of preventing wakefulness at night. The habitual use of alcohol, under the above conditions, does not lead to its abuse.

It is not necessary to speak here of the employment of alcohol in the treatment of disease, in which it is sometimes of inestimable service.

(2) The effects of alcohol, when habitually taken in excess, are both general and special. The most common general effect is a diminished

Hosted by Google

power of resistance to injurious external influences, such as the high temperature of tropical countries or the excessive cold of arctic regions, severe bodily injuries, etc. It is a common observation that the greatest number of victims to the diseases of hot climates are those who are accustomed to drink large quantities of alcohol. Those who most readily succumb to hardship, as to shipwreck, to famine, to bad hygienic influences, etc., are chiefly the intemperate. This diminished power of resistance is also shown by the great mortality among drinking persons who have been attacked by ordinary diseases of any severity or who are the subjects of severe bodily injuries. Pneumonia is justly dreaded as one of the most dangerous of zymotic diseases, but a healthy person rarely dies of acute pneumonia. Even young children attacked with it recover, in the majority of cases, if previously in good health. The fatal cases are those of patients who are already suffering from grave disease (the subjects of Bright's disease, for instance), who are exhausted by overwork or privation, who are very old, and, above all, who are accustomed to the use of liquor in excess. The same is true, though to a less extent, of many other acute diseases, such as typhoid fever, pleurisy, peritonitis, rheumatism, erysipelas, etc. The dangerous and often fatal effects of injuries, wounds, fractures, concussions, and burns among alcoholic subjects are well known.

The special diseases to which alcoholic intemperance directly predisposes are less numerous than is commonly supposed, owing partly to the fact that it is often doubtful how far alcoholism is a symptom or a cause of disease, and perhaps also to the exaggerated statements of the advocates of total abstinence, who sometimes find in intemperance the source of almost every departure from health. But, if limited in number, they include some of the most dreadful maladies with which the human race is afflicted. Functional disorders of the digestive organs are common among the intemperate, giving rise to various forms of indigestion, or dyspepsia, with pain, nausea, and vomiting; but, on the whole, disease of the stomach itself is less common among drunkards than one would suppose. There is no reason to suppose that cancer of the stomach or gastric ulcer, for instance, is of more frequent occurrence in the intemperate than the temperate or abstinent; but chronic gastric catarrh is undoubtedly often due to the abuse of alcohol. Cirrhosis of the liver (the so-called hobnail liver or gin-drinker's liver) is mainly caused by excessive spirit drinking; but it is not a common disease, and the number of drunkards who have cirrhosis is comparatively small.

The lungs are not often affected among alcoholic subjects; but, as already said, acute pulmonary diseases are apt to be fatal among them. Many fatal cases of so-called pneumonia, both among intemperate and other persons, are not pneumonia at all, but a dropsical condition of the lung, caused by disease of the heart or kidneys. Consumption is not directly caused by intemperance, and some medical men of experience even believe that the use of alcohol is a prophylactic against that disease. It is certainly often of great value in its treatment.

Hosted by Google

Disease of the heart is common among spirit drinkers, especially fatty degeneration of the organ, resulting in weakness and inability to carry on the circulation, which is followed by dropsy of the lungs and other organs. The blood vessels are also liable to disease of the same character. The capillaries dilate, causing congestion of various parts; while the larger arteries are subject to structural alterations, rendering them fragile. When the cerebral arteries are thus affected, they sometimes rupture, causing apoplexy.

It is still uncertain how far the chronic affections of the kidneys, grouped together under the name of Bright's disease, owe their origin to excessive use of alcohol. In the opinion of very high authorities, no such causative relation exists.

The most terrible effects of excessive indulgence in alcohol are seen in diseases of the nervous system. The time at my disposal would hardly enable me even to enumerate the different forms of nervous disease to which it gives rise. I can only allude to two or three of the most important ones. Besides the alarming and often fatal symptoms following cerebral hemorrhage or apoplexy, the dilatation of the vessels from fatty degeneration of their walls affects the nutrition of the brain, in consequence of the disturbance of the cerebral circulation. This is seen most conspicuously in the meninges, or envelopes surrounding the brain, sometimes in the form of simple congestion, at others as an inflammatory process, or meningitis, usually of a chronic form, and giving rise to various disorders of motion and sensation,— to tremors of the limbs, to paralysis, to impairment or perversion of the special senses, especially the sight and hearing, to loss of sleep, to long-continued headache, to epilepsy, and other convulsive attacks, etc.

But far more important than these effects of alcoholism is the debasing influence of the disease upon the mind. From fifteen to twenty per cent. of all the cases of mental disease are due to alcohol. The moral sense, the will, and the intellect are gradually involved in a process of deterioration which often results in complete ruin. The character of the individual undergoes an entire change. However conscientious, upright, faithful, considerate he may have been previously, he gradually loses the conception of honor, of justice, of duty, of affection. His self-respect vanishes. He betrays his trusts, and commits acts which make him amenable to the criminal law. The enfeeblement of the will shows itself in hesitation and indecision, rendering him incapable of conducting successfully his regular avocations, and entailing loss of business and of property.

The intellectual disorders of alcoholism are both acute — as the mania of drunkenness and delirium tremens — and chronic, including melancholia, chronic mania, dementia, and dipsomania, the latter being a paroxysmal form of intemperance, in which the individual may remain perfectly abstinent during intervals of months and even years, and then suddenly break out into the wildest excesses.

Hosted by Google

There is a structural disease of the nerves, giving rise to pain, weakness, and paralysis in various parts of the body, which is frequently caused by excessive indulgence in brandy, gin, and other kinds of alcoholic liquors. This is sometimes seen in women who indulge secretly in wine or spirit.

(3) The causes of excessive indulgence in alcohol include the predisposing and the exciting. Among the former are race and climate. Intemperance is more common in the northern countries in Europe than in the southern. The Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, and Celtic races are especially prone to it. On the other hand, the people of France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal are comparatively free from alcoholic excess, although the use of wine is universal among them. Of still greater importance in the production of alcoholism is the influence of heredity. A large proportion of those who habitually take liquor to excess are descendants of intemperate parents or grandparents, or of persons afflicted with various nervous disorders, as insanity, neuralgia, epilepsy, etc. Many are the offspring of criminals. A feeble nervous organization, often inherited, gives rise to mental and physical suffering which can be temporarily relieved by stimulants; and a habit of excessive indulgence is thus easily formed.

The exciting causes of intemperance in alcohol are familiar to every one, and it would be impossible to enumerate all of them here. I need only mention example and association, occupation,—especially such as exposes to excessive fatigue, loss of sleep, or inclement weather,—grief, disappointment, loss of property or of reputation. Where the predisposition to alcoholism exists, the slightest cause is sufficient to develop the latent tendency. Without the predisposition, the exciting causes have but little effect, although, of course, intoxication from accidental circumstances may occur independently of predisposition and in those who are not accustomed to the use of liquor.

(4) The treatment of chronic alcoholism is one of great difficulty, and comparatively few patients are cured after the disease is established. It is toward its prevention that our efforts are most successfully directed. The children and other descendants of inebriates, as well as of those suffering from other forms of nervous disease, should be sedulously guarded from the danger of forming the habit of drinking spirit; and, under proper care, the evil can, in many cases, be averted. This is not the place to enter into the details of the treatment, which consists more in careful oversight and in hygienic measures than in the administration of drugs. Even when the disease is established, it is now more frequently cured than formerly, in consequence of improved methods of treatment which are employed by skilful physicians in institutions especially intended for such cases. But the patient should be under competent medical supervision for a very long time, since relapses are not uncommon, especially among dipsomaniacs, owing to their yielding to temptation in an unguarded moment.

The treatment of acute alcoholism, or the immediate effects of large

Hosted by Google

doses of spirit, depends, of course, upon the symptoms, and does not concern us here. How far the habit of dram-drinking which produces it is capable of being prevented or controlled by direct interference is still undetermined. I think that much is to be hoped for in the dissemination of ideas of self-respect and morality among the class which is most addicted to intoxicating drinks. Some of us here present can recollect the time when occasional intoxication was hardly looked upon as a disgrace, even in a man of high position. It is now almost unknown except among the lowest and most degraded classes of society. The exclusion of spirit drinkers from all employments involving skill and responsibility; the diffusion of industrial education; the establishment of reformatories for criminals; the provision of rational amusements and occupations during leisure hours, to occupy the time ordinarily spent in the dram-shop; improvement in the hygiene and comfort of the dwellings of the poor; the growth of a more wholesome public sentiment,— appear to me to be the chief means to which we must look for the suppression of intemperance.

Hosted by Google

RELIGION IN THE HOME.

BY REV. JOSEPH MAY.

WHICH of us, turning his mind back through the associations of past years, revisiting so the days of childhood and infancy, does not call up with inexpressible tenderness the quiet communings with his *mother* as he prepared for bed, her gentle comments on the events and experiences of the day, the hymns she said, and the little prayer in which all culminated,—

"Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep.
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take"?

It has been called by some a dreary and foreboding petition. Perhaps it is not cheerful. But did any *child* ever think of that? Not if a loving voice taught it to him, and said it with him.

There is no experience in life more touching, no impression more lasting, than that of such an intercourse. Let us thank God for it, who have enjoyed it. Surely, a life has lacked much which has had it not. So all hearts which have known it would testify.

A shallow and wayward character, who once occupied a certain place in our American literature, wrote tenderly once (as, indeed, more than once, on the same theme):—

"My mother's voice! how often creeps
Its cadence o'er my lonely hours,—
Like healing on the wings of sleep,
A dew on the unconscious flowers!
I might forget her melting prayer
When pleasure's pulses madly fly;
But in the still unbroken air
Her gentle tones come stealing by,
And years of sin and sorrow flee,
And leave me at my mother's knee."

"The book of Nature, and its print
Of beauty on the whispering sea,
Gives still to me some lineament
Of what I have been taught to be.
My heart is hardened, and, perhaps,
My manliness has drunk up tears,
And there's a mildew on the lapse
Of a few miserable years;
But Nature's book is even yet
With all my mother's lessons writ."

Hosted by Google

Such lines cannot be the product of affected feeling. Or, at least, the recollection was genuine; and it must have been founded in some such quiet communings as I spoke of. They are a true antitype of our relations with our spiritual Father and God.

There are some other little verses,— a real gem of our literature,— which, no doubt, you all know, and remember their sportive but malodorous connection. He that wrote these was incapable of affectation, as he was a great master of our English speech.

Do you recall it,— the picture of the vessel at dawn, floundering in the Mediterranean squall, and the hidden perturbations of mind and body amid the motley company of passengers? And how, as all quieted down, there came to the wandering father's heart that thought of his far-away home, which made him write,—

"But when, its force expended,
The harmless storm was ended,
And as the sunrise splendid
Came blushing o'er the sea,
I thought, while day was breaking,
My little girls were waking
And smiling and making,
A prayer at home for me"?

I am to speak of religion in the home, and these touches of nature reveal to us what it can do. They show this for it: that it is *possible* to influence children deeply and permanently through what we call religious habits,— habits of devotion, if you would have them described more strictly. But they are religious habits; for they touch the sentiment of religion, and they do the work of religion,— not all of it, of course, but one and an essential part of it. They do this at least: they make a tender place in the heart, whereon other impressions falling gain a more effectual entrance there; they break up the soil of the young heart (and young hearts are a little hard, to begin with, before suffering makes them tender), break up the soil, I say, in which so many seeds are to fall, and make it more ready for the good seed which may fall from God's hand in we know not how many days.

Something of such religious habits there must be, something of religious suggestion from parent to child, something of interpretation of the observations of the young mind on life into the terms of religion, or the religious side of the child's mind will remain torpid, awaking late, if ever. And though you train it morally, with care, if you do *not* do the religious work, if you do not alongside conscience plant piety, the character may be noble and strong, but it will lack grace and beauty and lose the sweetest joy of living.

For the heart that has opened only to the realities of earthly relations — that is, to the moralities — is living unconscious of its own highest relations; and, though God is not failing it, he is not reaching it as he fain

Hosted by Google

would, and it is failing of the spiritual culture of an open consciousness of relation to him and to the spiritual world.

Richter says, "Efface God from the heart, and everything which lies above or below the earth is only a recurring enlargement of it: that which is above the earth would become only a higher grade of mechanism, and consequently earthly."

The whole task of educating children in religious things is profoundly delicate, I need not say. Striving not to err on one side, we easily err on the other. We may easily make devotional habits arid and wearisome, but we may easily do a great wrong by being so afraid of this fault as to omit definite religious influences altogether. I knew once a mother — one of the loveliest mothers I have ever known, and mother of one of the loveliest families I have ever known — who, through sincere conscientiousness, pursued the latter course, omitted religious customs in her home, through fear of hypocrisy, of tedium, and the like. And, late in her life, she told me that she wished she could begin the training of her children all over again, and supply the deficiency herself had created and permitted. And why? Because, in the characters of her children, then adult, the effects had appeared. In part of them, a sense of loss, a want of familiarity with religious conceptions, a consciousness of deficient training, had made itself felt somewhat painfully; and, in another part, a total absence of religious feeling, of the grateful recognition of the source of all blessings, of that beautiful thing which I fear too many moderns are lacking in, piety. So that character remained a little hard, bald, ungracious, although of lofty and exigent morality.

I am sure it is a sad pity to err on this side. And, although it would be easy to draw pictures of those who have erred on the other, I do not believe we need err on the other, if we observe two things; namely, a perfect sincerity in ourselves and a thorough sympathy with our children. If we conduct devotional exercises in our homes in a mere formal spirit, the mind of the child, which is like the sensitive plate of a photographic machine, feels it at once and is repelled, wearied, turned from religion. But, if we do the same thing with real truth of feeling in ourselves; if, confessedly, between us and our children our forms are imperfect, yet the best we have the art to devise,— then the defects of one method will not defeat the aim. Our own sincerity and the oneness of feeling between us and them will atone for unavoidable defects of method.

And this, because in this sincerity of purpose and effort is the real uprising of the soul in piety,— the real thing is done so; and, besides, in the mutual outgoing of feeling, of sympathy between parents and child, is a close type of the emotion we are striving to cultivate toward God. I have no time to speak of forms and ways, and it is of little consequence. Any form you devise, any way you pursue, will do sufficiently well, if you keep it fresh through your own sincerity, and if you keep a true, open sympathy between yourselves and your children as you practise them. What

Hosted by Google

you *must* preserve is this community of purpose, and the sense that all, old and young, are doing the best they can to open their eyes and their hearts to God and to conduct their lives as responsible to him.

I am calling this general sort of culture in the home religious; and, if you note its peculiar effect, you will see that I have a strict right so to call it. Religion means "binding," you know; and the peculiar and certain effect of this culture is to bind the home together, to unite parents and children, to make the home circle a unit. In this respect, nothing else can take its place. Common amusements are a happy thing. Home music is a delightful thing. These also tend to unite the members of a home. But the one thing which goes down to the depths of character and feeling is religion; and, when you truly unite parents and children in religious feeling and effort, you have welded them as nothing less profound and searching can do. Let them once feel at one in the deep yearning for God, in the earnest purpose to live holy lives, as in his sight; let them habitually lay bare their hearts together before him, in confession, penitence, aspiration,— and they are growing at one in their deepest life.

And so that superficial character whose words I just quoted testified, when, over years of absence and foolish living, his prodigal heart turned back to find its mother's. And so that father's heart stretched out over a thousand leagues of sea, and met the hearts of his babes, rising toward him on the wings of their morning prayer.

But, of course, no amount of, or regularity in, religious usages is sufficient alone. Of course, none of these can be true except as the token of a real religious spirit in the home. And, while devotional practices tend to generate this, it is much truer to say that they must, to be genuine, be the natural expression and fruit of it.

So we have a great deal more to do than merely to keep up daily prayers or to offer thanks at meals. Above all else, let parents remember one thing. It is a literal fact that, at the beginning, they symbolize, they stand in the place of, Providence to their children. They are children's natural and highest ideals. As the avenue of all the bounties which children receive from Providence, they mould infantile conceptions of what Providence is. Especially under a religion which makes the parental relation of God to man the highest type it wears, which is full of the symbolism of this relation, the child's thought of God develops in his heart according to that type which his parents' character and conduct impress on it.

As a rule, young children can and do have little real conception of God. How can they have much? How little the most adult and enlarged mind can have! In this, indeed, we are all babes together. Childish religion is, and must needs be, chiefly imitative. But, on the other hand, children are highly receptive, the religious instincts are in them; and, into the unoccupied recesses of their mind, they will usually take promptly, deeply, and very permanently the idea, which, consciously or unconsciously, their elders are giving them.

Hosted by Google

So, as this illustrates again the value of reasonable formal habits of religion, it suggests with tenfold urgency the importance of the examples their parents set them. Out of the uprightness, purity, dignity, gentleness of parents' characters and lives, they must shape their conceptions of the infinite righteousness, holiness, majesty, and love of God. Religion is essentially a spirit,— a spirit of reverence, love, devotion, rectitude, service. It is as a spirit that we want, first and last, to attain it and to develop it in our children. The religious spirit is a part of character, a part of the reality of selfhood. What I have intimated as to its cultivation in the young amounts to this: that it is developed and maintained chiefly through the pervasive influence of example,— the sacred contagion of itself, existing in the hearts and lives of those who have attained it.

But I have implied, also, more than this,— that even this abstract and spiritual thing is the subject of method and system, as everything human is. It does not come haphazard, nor without intention and effort is it propagated with any certainty. The young will not be prayerful if they are never taught to pray: they will not know and love God if God is not revealed to them through the best efforts their parents can make to reveal him. Or, at best, they will have to attain all this by painful, groping struggles, through which, in a measure certainly, all have to go, but which may be largely, very largely, alleviated and guided by parental instruction.

So, besides general influence and example, I am sure there ought to be specific religious instruction of our children,— instruction for which they shall be consciously indebted to their parents above all other persons. There is, pretty certainly, a too great readiness in these days to trust all special religious instruction to the Sunday-school or to chance. In former times there was among us Unitarians a jealousy, which became almost superstitious, of infringing on the freedom of the child's mind by conveying to him specific religious ideas. The sentiment had truth in it which is not to be overlooked. All religious teaching, by and to whomsoever, ought to be suggestive, not dogmatic. It ought to be presented, not as the absolute and final truth (as the pope presents it), but as the highest intuition, the best result of the experience, of the elder or wiser mind. God forbid that we preachers should present truth to other minds in any different spirit from this! But that which the parent has attained *the child has a right to:* to know what his parents think, believe, trust, is his right as much as to receive their moral example. Offer it as your own best attainment, as what you most deeply think and trust,— not as if you had a power to unlock the divine arcana, but as an example of what the sincere seeker may find and has found,— then the child will profit by it, and will not be dwarfed or narrowed by it. And no Sunday-school, or even church, can do this work in place of parents or so well as parents. What they can do is peculiar in quality, and exceeds all other agencies in depth of influence. In religion as in morals, the institution of the home appears specifically designed to facilitate the genuine instruction of the young. All formal instruction is, at

Hosted by Google

best, a substitute for that which is incidental and spontaneous, real, which is called forth by the various successive experiences of actual life. There is nothing which would not be better taught incidentally than formally: only, in many things we cannot possibly wait for incidental opportunity,— life is not long enough nor varied enough. But for the most important things, for piety, for morality, for taste and grace, common life does furnish constant natural opportunities of instruction. They enter into and pervade it, they are the ideal rule of it; and so in the common daily tenor are the best occasions for teaching them. How much more happily you can teach mutual self-sacrifice or common gratitude to a group of children related as brothers and sisters than to a similar group related as a Sunday-school class! How continually occasions are arising which need only to be interpreted to teach the goodness of God, the sacredness of time, the joy of unselfish living! With a confused and hasty half-hour in Sunday-school, a skilful teacher may do much. Yet all, abstractly. How much may not a faithful father and mother do, passing their time with their four or five children in the actual discharge of the functions, the constant solution of the problems of life! It cannot be without a higher purpose than the physical that God "setteth the solitary in families." Physically, we might have developed singly, or grown as apples on a tree. The family institution has had a moral purpose. It provides for experience as a sort of microcosm of the greater world of social life. The parent, man or woman, is blind to its meaning, insensible to its sanctity, who does not feel the obligation pressing constantly to use the opportunities of home for the instruction of the children in the highest things. "A word fitly spoken, how good is it!" The thought of duty, the thought of God, gently presented when duty is pressing, when the goodness of God has been manifested in the joy of life or the need of God suggested by its sorrow, how luminous it is, how convincing, as compared with what it can be, offered abstractly,— that is, apart from an immediate and vital relation to the circumstances and emotions of actual experience!

But it is one of the highest blessings of the home relation that the older members not only teach, but are themselves taught, and how happily! What sincere and earnest parent does not find that his sense of the value of all forms of truth, his conviction of the reality of life,— its present, its future,— are deepened immeasurably by his relations with his children! What we teach we still more learn. If we keep our youth simple, innocent, genuine, yet manly and womanly, how, in the action of their minds upon the incidents of life, we see truth revealed which almost nothing else could show us so clearly or so sweetly! The parent is often abashed by the purity, the candor, the dignity, of the child. He is refreshed and stimulated by the readiness with which the young accept lofty truth, noble purpose and principle. The way he perhaps opens they tread more confidently, more devotedly, than he had felt that he could do. So they teach and strengthen in their turn. Unhappy he who misses this help and cheer

Hosted by Google

in his life! More unhappy he who, having the opportunity of it, fails to embrace it,— the father, the mother, who lives apart from the child, indifferent, forgetful, neglectful, or hesitating as to the deeper part of life in which is the *all* of it, really, of which the outward, the "practical," as we call it, is only the shadow and the shell. Unfortunate are the hurry, the preoccupation, of our lives, which come between too many children and parents, and rob them of that mutual edification in the deepest things which the home was made to provide for.

I will not open the question whether there is, in our modern homes, more or less than formerly of that "ineffable something," as it has been happily called, which we speak of as the religious spirit. But it is perfectly certain that it must be in them adequately, or we shall have no true homes.

As they are its natural nursery, so it is the secret of their own joy and peace. A worldly home can never be a true one or a very happy one. It must needs be selfish and gross and trivial. Its members are not finding the depths which may actually lie, though unopened, in each other. They are doing no real and great service to each other. They will be bound together by no strong cords. Their very affection for each other will be of an animal, not of a spiritual, quality. Religion, the common recognition of an All-holy God, the common feeling of dependence on him, of responsibility to him, and of gratitude toward him; the common sense of duty, and as well of frailty; the sense of a common need of help and pardon; the recognition of the world of eternal realities, giving dignity to life and awakening aspiration and noble purpose,— these are what shall refine and elevate the home, and make its members deeply at one with each other, through mutual helpfulness and mutual joy in the things which are alone rewarding and sure.

Hosted by Google

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH.

BY REV. BROOKE HERFORD.

THE home and the church are the two great poles of this whole subject of religious education. The day-school can do something. The Sunday-school can do much. But the religious education of the young, to be wholesome, natural, and complete, must begin in the home, and must culminate in the church. In the home should begin the informal influences of parental piety and the first steps of religious teaching. These influences should at least be strengthened and encouraged in the day-school, and made the object of definite work in the Sabbath-school or pastor's class. But it is in the church that they are to be presented to the child-mind in their full force and impressiveness. There the religious influence of the few at home widens out into the felt religious companionship with the world's best life in the present, and throughout the long past. There, in the church, religion is presented in that overmastering realization of divine and eternal things, which is the only real impulse to the ministry. And there religion stands out in the dignity and solemnity of a great public and world-wide institution, whose foundations are in the deep places of the world. And so, here, in the church, the wondering and often fitful religion of the child should be clinched and deepened into the firm convictions and strong religious interest of manhood and womanhood.

And now, to come closer to the practical question,— the influence of the church on the religious education of the young depends upon two things: first, on the spirit in which they are taken there; second, on what they find there.

1. The spirit in which they are taken there. How do the parents feel about the church? How do they go? Do they go listlessly and irregularly, and as if it were of no importance to be punctual? Do they go superciliously and critically? Is the talk that the children hear at home about it fault-finding with the music and disparagement of the preacher's defects, of which all preachers must have some? Do the children hear the service spoken of as a sort of wearisome exercise, and the sermon chiefly remarked upon for its length? When the mother sets off, do the children see the father staying behind reading the newspaper or sauntering round the garden? Then will the children not want to go; and, unless the preacher is next door to a genius and an angel, they are not likely to get much religious education by going. On the other hand, let the children see that their parents are loyally attached to the church; let them see that

Hosted by Google

it is something the parents not merely go to, but belong to and want to help along; let the going to church be felt throughout the household as the central engagement and interest of the Sunday; let the church and its minister and its services be spoken of with that kind earnestness which does not exclude frank discussion of it; let the children see their parents careful to be on time, and reverent, earnest, and attentive while there,— and that young church-going will be among the strongest influences of their youth, and the dearest memories of their age.

But would you oblige children to go to church? it is asked. That is not a question that need arise. If the home is what it should be, and the church is at all what it should be, there will be no question of obliging. The children will want to come, and like to come. Some people are in favor of separate services especially for children instead of the church services. I believe it to be a mistake. It is on a par with that other cry for special literature for children which is filling their shelves with so much weak, silly rubbish. The surest way for children to grow up fond of reading is for them to grow up in the wholesome companionship of a home where the elders love reading, and read aloud and talk about what they read. Those children will grow up to love it, even if they never see a child's book in their lives. So let children be brought up in any sort of happy, religious companionship with their elders; and best of all services they will like, not some separate one in the school-room, but to go where their elders go. They may understand little, at first, anyhow; but there is a great deal goes to the enjoying a service, and being awed and religiously impressed by it, besides the intellectual comprehension. Have children never loved to go to church, or derived no good from it, all through the first eighteen centuries? For it is only in this nineteenth that their going has ever been questioned. Don't you suppose that little children counted it a privilege to go to the first "upper rooms" where the disciples met, even though Paul himself sometimes preached so long that even a young man would drop asleep, and fall off his seat,— let alone the children? Don't you suppose the little Roman children ever begged and cried to go to the secret churches in the Catacombs? All through the ages, little children went with their parents, and wondered, and did not understand much, but, if their elders were interested, caught their interest, and later learned their meaning. I suppose the very grimmest sect of the Puritans was the church of the Scottish covenant. But the little ones lay in their mothers' arms at those long field-preachings; and, as they grew older, they pricked up their ears, and wondered what it all meant. What could they make, indeed, of those dreary, long, Calvinistic discourses, reasoned out to a dozen heads, on divine decrees and predestination? Yet something made them proud and glad to be there,— so proud, so glad, that all through that long generation of awful persecution the very boys and maidens bore as noble a part as any of the Covenanters; and as the preachers, one by one, were hunted down and martyred in the

Hosted by Google

grass-market, there never were wanting youths, sometimes hardly more than children, to take up the blood-stained mantle of their ministry. Friends, the pleasure and profit of children being with their parents in church depend not upon how much the children understand, but upon how much the parents feel. Children like to be with their elders; and, in these deeper parts of life, it is good for them to be, and good for the older people to have them. Let a father sit lovingly among his little children, and it will be a pleasure to them to look over the same hymn-book with him long before they can read more than an occasional word,— a pleasure, by and by, to find the place for him,— a pleasure to listen to the singing, and now and then catch some favorite tune they have been used to at home. And then it will be an awe to sit by him in the stillness of the prayer; and, when the sermon comes,— well, if there is nothing for it but to let the little heads nestle up against him for a quiet sleep, I will only say — remembering occasional lapses in these last overweighted days — that I think they might do worse. Gradually, as they grow older, they will be able, at least, to learn the text; and now and then the little ears will prick up at some striking anecdote or illustration, and so the church takes its place in their young lives as something happy and attractive.

But is this general, inarticulate influence the only way in which the church can help religious education? No: this is only the beginning. By far the greater work lies beyond. What I have said touches the spirit in which they may be led to church. Whether they will go permanently and find its higher educating power depends on what they find there.

And so I have to speak of what our young people should find in the church, in order that it may do its true work in religious education.

1. I would say that, apart from any teaching, they want to meet in the church a spirit responsive to that in which I have desired them to be led thither,— a spirit of cordial welcome from their elders, an atmosphere charged with brotherliness and helpfulness. They want to find working societies that will try to make a place for the young, and enlist them for the active service of the King. Hitherto, our young people have been too much left just to sit with their parents, not asked to give anything, not asked to do anything, feeling themselves outsiders, feeling as if it was something of their elders, in which they have no part. This wants altering. I haven't time to enter into details. I can but outline these needs of true church education.

2. I put as the most distinctively teaching influence of the church the reverent holding up of the Bible as the supreme text-book of religion. I do not mean, of course, any pretence of keeping up the old idea of its being all-inspired or infallible. I believe it is that old idea which has done more than anything else to lead to the abandonment of its use. But it is possible to speak perfectly frankly about this, and yet to bring out in the Scripture reading of the church the unique authoritativeness and weight with which the Bible, with all the imperfections which it brings with it from

Hosted by Google

the world's childhood, voices the word of God's spirit and the unfolding revelations of his truth. I know that the church service is not a Bible class, and does not want to be. But there is much more possible in the service of our churches to make the Bible, if not fully understood, at least rightly appreciated. The fact is — as modern scholarship is clearly finding, as Max Müller's publication of the *Sacred Books of the East* brings out with unexpected force — that the Bible, as a whole, stands absolutely unparalleled among Scriptures, and is worthy of that unique reverence into which it grew through many centuries. Let it be kept in that unique reverence! By all means, let us study the other great religions of the world in our religious classes; but, in the church, what we want is that religion which, as the result of that study, stands the noblest. In the church, we want the results rather than the processes of the slowly sifting reverence of time, and so there the words we want to hear are those which have grown into the Bible of Christendom; and I think it is best for us to have those in their own simple weight, not weakened by confusing comparisons with others. I know that there are some of our ministers who think differently, but I am convinced that this is the almost universal feeling of the people in our churches. They may not read the Bible as much as they might do at home, but they do want to hear it in the church; and it jars upon their souls to take their friends or their children to find the solemn words of Isaiah or of Christ sandwiched between the lesser words even of such sages as Buddha or Carlyle. Only, let us make the best of the Bible in the church! It might be made more interesting than it often is by a few words to preface the reading chosen, by telling what it refers to, and giving, as it were, some glimpse of the ancient living context. In some churches, it is the custom to make a running commentary as the reading goes on. I always shrink from that, as calculated to weaken the simple power of the old words; but a few brief, pointed words may often bring out a half-obscured meaning, and so the Bible might be made more interesting, more like a living divine word, to those who hear.

But, third, and finally, apart from any of these details, the highest educating power of a true church consists in clinching and deepening the various other influences of religion. These other influences must be more or less imperfect. The religious home-training partakes of the defects of the parental personality. That of the day-school can only be very vague and general. Even that of the Sunday-school is apt to be too merely lesson-like, with distractions which often hinder piety rather than help it. But, in the church, the whole subject should be lifted up into a higher, stronger thing. In the church, the fitful faith of individuals, the uncertain moods of isolated souls, are blended into one, and, rested on the ancient testimonies of the world, appear as the grand realities they are; for a church does not mean a debating society to find whether there be a religion or not. It means an institution of religion. So the whole church service should be quick with a triumphant, realizing faith, and its crowning work

Hosted by Google

should be to impress religion on the hearts of the young as the mighty, world-old reality and certainty that it is. Yes: I say certainty. I know that some would forbid such a word. There has been a cant of Liberalism that all questions should be held as open questions. All questions are not open questions. I know, of course, that there are no questions that may not be reopened, if you will; but that does not make them open questions. You may reopen the most settled axiom of geometry, the most settled fact of science. A colored brother in the South lately reopened the question whether the earth is round or flat. He reopened it perfectly sincerely; yet does that make it an open question? And so I say that the great basal realities of religion are not "open questions"! Why, even if we only had evolution to go by, that is sufficient. I say that, after, at least, six thousand years of man's slow, orderly development, and of the development of religion as part of man,— development by the same slow-moulding pressure of the facts, and therefore just as correspondent to the facts as the lines of the great river beds or mountain chains, and just as much among the massive certainties of being. And they want recognizing as such. Not in any hard dogmatism, but in a reverent sense, that, as God's cycles pass, some things are settled, not to be perpetually reopened, except at the cost of all life's best stabilities. Or, if they must be reopened in the study, a man had better stay in his study till he has closed them again; for I do not mean that a minister should affect certainty where he does not feel it. I mean that he has no business to be a minister till he does feel it. I do not mean that he ever can be certain about everything; but, for the great basal realities of God and immortality and duty and worship and this great leadership of Christ, a man can do little good in helping the world's religious life until he not only feels these as realities, but until they are to him great compelling realities,— the very things which compel him to his ministry. That is what has got to be, where the church is to do its true work in clinching and crowning the religious education of the young. Can that work be done, if a church's very platform is not a triumphant certainty, but an organized doubt? Is it likely to be done in churches which apply the new idea of university scholarship,— or shall I not say misapply it,— and put religion as one of their optionals? A church in which religion is an optional! But I wrong the university in the comparison, for no university has ever put scholarship as an optional in its teachers; while it is gravely proposed by some to leave religion an optional, even in the minister! In the name of the young who are to be subject to such teaching, I plead for something stronger. It may not matter to us elders. We are tough and settled, and can listen quietly, only sad that the mind of the world should be so confused and puzzled; but I cannot help feeling how much it matters to the young. I know it is done out of tenderness to some who stand outside; but I am a little tired of this tenderness to these hypothetical agnostics, who are supposed to be eager to join us, if we don't say "God" too plainly. I don't believe it helps them.

Hosted by Google

I am sure that, meanwhile, it hurts ourselves. Especially it hurts the young. I know that here and there some personal intensity of faith may minimize the evil of such a church position, perhaps even wholly neutralize it; but the individual goes, the church still stands. And I want to have our churches stand, not poised upon the intensity of an individual, but broad-based upon the world-old verities of God. I believe we need this, that our churches may be the best they have in them to be, to our own people. I believe we need it, that they may be the best light and help to those outside. I am sure we need it for the sake of our children.

Here, then, are the elements that seem to stand out as most needful for the church to have its true religious influence on the young: —

1. That they be drawn there by parents themselves, in earnest about it.

2. That they find not so much *special services* for the young as live, earnest services holding their elders in their interest.

3. That they find a heartier welcome and place in the church life.

4. That the Bible be more carefully held up, so as to interest them and win their appreciating reverence.

5. And most of all, crowning all, that the whole spirit of the church life be a glad, triumphant, realistic faith, which will touch them with the feeling that here is life's grandest certainty!

And, O friends, you *all* may have some part in this! You all may help the children in your homes, or whom you meet in your friends' homes, to think more of the church, and to be more glad to go to it. There have been waves of doubt passing over society in the past generation, which have seemed to slacken the hold of the church upon society. But the churches stand, and the deep needs of the human heart are still the same forever. Life is poor that has no worship in it! The land is poor in which the churches are little cared for! Oh, help me here to work for a better state of things,— to make this church of ours a church of the young as well as of the old, and so to build up the young lives about us in the beauty and enthusiasm and victorious strength of this simple religion of Jesus Christ!

Hosted by Google

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: THE INFLUENCES OF THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL.

BY REV. SETH C. BEACH.

I HAVE been asked to speak briefly of the part in religious nurture which properly belongs to the Sunday-school. First of all, What is the Sunday-school? Is it properly a school, as we understand a school, or is it in truth a department or function of the church, as we understand a church? An answer to these questions will greatly aid us in our inquiry as to what particular work the Sunday-school ought to undertake to do and what kind of results it ought to aim to reach. The object and method of a school differ somewhat from the object and method of a church. Undoubtedly, the Sunday-school began its career as a school, properly so called. Since Paul discovered that providentially the law had been a "schoolmaster," it has been dawning upon the Christian consciousness that the first step to take in Christianizing a barbarian is to educate him. When, therefore, a century ago, it entered into the heart of an apostolic Englishman to Christianize the young barbarians of his own city, he began at the foundation, and established schools, suggestively described as "Ragged Schools." They were very properly called schools, for such they were. In this form and for this purpose the Sunday-school began. Essentially of this character, I believe, English Sunday-schools still are. That is, they are schools, and, as in the beginning, "ragged schools." Except in large cities, we have happily very little need of such schools, and, with our free public schools everywhere, not even in the large cities. Either we do not need the Sunday-school at all or we need it for a different purpose.

The fact is, it has come into being with us to meet a different want. It happened that, about half a century ago, it was discovered that in American households the old-time customs of domestic worship and domestic religious nurture were giving way, falling into disuse, becoming obsolete. Plainly, children must receive some training, adapted to their years, in those things which most concern their souls; and the Sunday-school, as we have it, arose to do as it could what had once been perhaps better done, but what was fast ceasing to be done at all in the home.

It is common to reverse the order of events in this history, and say that, before the appearance of the Sunday-school, parents read the Bible with their children, knelt with them at the family altar, and interrogated, instructed, and admonished them concerning spiritual things; that the Sunday-school appeared when it had no reason for being; that its coming

Hosted by Google

has been a great providential mistake; that it took the work of religious training and nurture unceremoniously out of the hands of devout mothers and fathers, and made the good old customs of family worship and domestic instruction superfluous. Hence, the decadence of these usages in American homes. Alas, no! In its short existence of half a century, the Sunday-school has hardly achieved so much, either for good or ill. The fact is these things were sadly decayed in most households when the Sunday-school appeared. It came to occupy an empty space, left vacant by the changing customs of the time. As we have seen, it was called into existence to meet a very different want from that met by the English "Ragged Schools"; but from them came, no doubt, the idea, and, unhappily, also the name. Not the name "Ragged School," it is true,—that was too obviously a misnomer,—but the name "school," which, considering the particular exigency that with us the Sunday-school came to meet, was a misnomer only a little less gross, and quite as mischievous.

A good deal of misconception may be embodied and perpetuated in a name. The misconception which the Sunday-school embodies and perpetuates in its name is that it is a school. Hardly any conception could more completely dissever it from the church. Some of us would like to see the Sunday-school serve our children as a kind of vestibule to the church; but, certainly, no such idea is suggested by the name. A Sunday-school, by its name, no more implies a church than does a Sunday excursion or a Sunday newspaper. And I am mistaken if, except in Episcopalian and Catholic Christendom, the disconnection is not as complete in idea as in name. It is, I believe, the commonly received idea that the Sunday-school is quite a different thing from the church, quite without the pale,—a church enterprise, it is true, but an external enterprise, not quite so far away as an enterprise in China or Japan, but, otherwise, entirely similar. This complete separation between the idea of the Sunday-school and the idea of the church goes naturally, almost inevitably, with the conception of the Sunday-school as a school; and if, as I believe, it is the separation of two things which in idea ought to be joined, the misconception is most mischievous. We wish our children to be led into a consciousness that they are members of the great household of faith and life,—as Paul would say, of the body of Christ. It would seem that, at least, one of the results at which religious education in the Sunday-school ought to aim should be to develop this consciousness.

As a matter of fact, they develop a very different consciousness; namely, that the Sunday-school is merely a school, and that the church is very far away. Not a few of us have been in a kind of despair over the question how to get the children of the Sunday-school into the church. The answer would seem to be obvious. Attach the Sunday-school to the church. Consolidate the two bodies. Think of them as one, and teach the children and the parents of the children to think of them as one. This will be a religious result in the achievement of which the education and training of the church and Sunday-school may profitably combine.

Hosted by Google

The proper business of a church is worship. That is its reason for being. It is true, a certain space is allotted to a sermon in which a preacher may possibly be permitted to do a little teaching, provided he does it adroitly, as if by way of illustration, and quietly assumes that the matter is one with which everybody is familiar. But, in the main, it is not to be instructed that people go to church. Very few congregations would stand being instructed. Either they wish only to be entertained or they desire to worship. The one thing which they do not much care for is to be taught. They are right. Worship is or ought to be the primary business of a church.

If the Sunday-school were supposed to partake of the nature of a church, should we not instinctively feel that its primary business must also be worship? On the contrary, while it is not forgotten to leave a certain space for worship, everybody understands that the business of the Sunday-school, when it reaches its business, is instruction. So, surely, the teachers understand it, who sometimes enter the Sunday-school in a half-demented condition, because they have perhaps lost their way in the tangles of Old or New Testament geography or chronology. So, quite obviously, the pupils understand it. A class of boys in a certain Sunday-school had been studying with considerable interest the history of the Puritans. As a concluding exercise, the teacher undertook to make a few practical applications of the story or to draw out its obvious lessons. "Oh, now, you are talking religion," protested one of her pupils, who thought he knew the proper business of a Sunday-school, and who was not disposed to have it diverted from its purpose. The superintendent generally agrees with the boy, to the extent of thinking, quite evidently, that the chief business of the Sunday-school is instruction.

It used to be very common in Sunday-schools to reduce the element of worship to a short Scripture reading, followed by an extempore prayer, unhappily not always short, both by the superintendent, with the singing of a hymn by the children. The singing was the children's part of it. They always forgot to attend to the reading, and the prayer was generally over their heads. You have heard, perhaps, of the superintendent who, undertaking to lead the devotions of a flock of young worshippers, began, "The finite looks up to the Infinite,"— an ingenious attempt to conduct an exercise of devotion and to teach a lesson in metaphysics at the same time. The reduction of the element of worship to a few hasty and not always well-considered exercises by the superintendent indicates that with him, as with the teachers and the pupils, not devotion, but instruction, is the chief thing for which the Sunday-school is supposed to exist. This mistake, if it be one, comes of misconceiving the Sunday-school as a school. If it were considered an integral part of the church, there might still be a place for instruction. Whatever became of the instruction, we should at least endeavor to have worship. But it would not be allowed to usurp the place of worship. What a relief it would be to a modest teacher, quite lost in the

Hosted by Google

entanglements of Biblical arts and sciences, if she could persuade herself that, after all, the Sunday-school is not an academy, and that her chief work and her best work, at the head of her class, is done, not when she has made her pupils scholars, but when she has made them worshippers; not when she has grounded them in the geography of the Exodus or the architecture of the temple, but when she has led them to take an intelligent and reverent interest in their hymns and prayers. Clearly, it is not so much erudition as spiritual nurture which our children in the Sunday-school most need. No effort to make the strictly devotional part of the exercises rich, varied, interesting, and effective can possibly be misplaced. Let it be understood and felt that the responses, the hymns, and the prayers are not merely preliminaries to be shuffled off, but the very substance of the things for which the Sunday-school exists.

Were spiritual nurture less obviously the main business of the Sunday-school, there would still be reason for putting the chief emphasis upon worship. Selected with any degree of intelligence, it is this part of the exercises which is sure to be level to the comprehension, and to meet the needs of all ages and capacities. A child is very young, indeed, who will not get some glimmer of its meaning when you read such an utterance of devotion as, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want"; and you can leave him to feel his way into the response, "He causeth me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me by the side of still waters." This part of the teaching of a Sunday-school happily teaches itself. We have heard so much about the need of teachers who can teach, so much, also, about the extreme rarity of such teachers, that a modest person hardly dares to be seen at the head of an infant class. It is well, then, that there should be one part of the exercises, and that we should make the very utmost of that part, which, be it only reverently rendered, teaches its own lesson.

As all roads lead to Mecca, so, from many points of view, we come to one result,—that it is better to take your ideal of the Sunday-school from the church than from the school. What is best of all is to make the Sunday-school a part of the church,—the juvenile department, if you please, but let us receive it into the church, and admit it to full membership at once. So teacheth a parable found in one of the lost Gospels, which I will here translate, and with which I will close:—

The kingdom of heaven "is likened unto a certain man" which was an husbandman. And the husbandman had a flock of sheep upon which he set great store, as well he might; for it was a selected flock, and the sheep were comely. And the husbandman gave them into the charge of shepherds, that they might nourish the sheep, and care for the young and tender lambs, and so multiply the flock. And it happened that the shepherds were zealous, but foolish, and had a zeal not according to knowledge; and they separated the lambs from the sheep, and gathered the sheep into a yard, and the lambs they gathered into a yard for the lambs, and these yards were wide asunder, so that the lambs could not hear their mothers

Hosted by Google

call to them, if the mothers did call to them, as it is greatly to be feared they didn't, to come into the fold. Now, the yard in which the lambs were folded was never intended to hold full-grown sheep; and so it came to pass that, when the lambs had come to a certain size, they looked about them for some place where the fence was low, and, when they had found it, they gave a little leap and walked out, sometimes one by one, sometimes by twos, and sometimes by sevens. Then they wandered whithersoever they would; and some got entangled among thorns, and some slipped and fell from the rocks, and some went astray with a passing flock of black sheep. And the shepherds did not know what had become of them, and went to the sheepfold to see if, by accident, the stray lambs had gone there, and were bleating to be let in. And they were not there, and they were not bleating to be let in; and the shepherds greatly wondered that they were not.

Then the shepherds hung their harps upon a willow, and sat down to mourn. And they said within themselves: "Our flocks are well stricken in years, our sheep are dropping away by reason of old age, and, as if we had planned for it, we manage to lose all the young lambs. What hinders that our folds may not soon be empty, and the ground they occupy be utilized for some other branch of husbandry?"

Then came the husbandman, and said unto his servants: "Where is my flock? What have you done with my sheep?" And, alas! it was too plain what they had done with them. Then said the husbandman, in words which seem to be taken from the Book of Isaiah: "Behold, my watchmen are blind. . . . They are shepherds that cannot understand. . . . Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture. Ye have scattered my flock and driven them away, and have not visited them. Behold, I will visit upon you the evil of your doings; . . . and I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds. And they shall be fruitful and increase. And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them," — that is to say, shall take care of them.

So the husbandman set over his flock other shepherds, who were no more zealous than their predecessors, but who did better understand the business of this branch of husbandry. And these other shepherds said within themselves: "Is not the youngest lamb as truly in and of our flock as the most wrinkled and gray-headed sheep? If it be needful that the lambs, by reason of their tender years, be folded differently from sheep which are more mature, let it still be as a part of the fold, and let there be a plain gateway, often shown and sometimes opened, leading out of the little place where the lambs are tended into the large place where their mothers do feed and rest; and, when the lambs be grown, let the mothers come and call unto the lambs and encourage them and make them feel at home, and perhaps they will pass through the gateway which we have made for them, instead of breaking over the fence and running off into the wilderness." And it was so; and the lambs throve, and grew up as lambs should, and went with the sheep, and the flock was increased.

Hosted by Google

MUSIC AS A LANGUAGE OF RELIGION.

BY REV. JAMES VILA BLAKE.

I AM to speak of music as a language of religion. If I use the word "language" advisedly,— and music truly is a tongue of religion,— this is a fact of great import. For then, first, music may be a great help in our churches, if we take the music which truly utters religion; but, contrariwise, it may be a great hindrance or harm, if we take that which utters only non-religion, or, still worse, irreligion,— as much as if in the pulpit we were to discourse of trade, of the market, or, worse, of trivial gayeties, or, worst, of unclean sports, with gusto. Forsooth, I cannot conceive how preachers who make great point of the cleaving of the pulpit to its own themes, and are shocked or affronted if there be not a deep religious intent to every sermon, saying that then the preaching is no better than lecturing or haranguing,— I know not how these, I say, so loosely admit into the choir music which is scenic or passionate or trifling, and was written by the composers to these ends.

Music is a language which hath in it a vocabulary of religion and morals, and many other vocabularies also of lower themes, and even of loose and wanton things; for no lexicon ever was so huge that it matched music in syllables of emotion, and in expression of that depth of life where man is not a congerie of faculties, but all one, and where feeling is the same as that reason of which Milton speaks, saying, "Reason also is choice." But some think not so. Richard Grant White has said that "music is entirely without rational significance or moral power. . . . That a fine appreciation of even the noblest music is not an indication of mental elevation or of moral purity or of delicacy of feeling, or even, except in music, of refinement of taste." This in the *Atlantic Monthly* for October, 1878. In December of the same year, he writes: "Music lends itself to deviltry just as to any other emotion that asks for pleasurable audible expression; and, what is more, the same music will serve equally well both God and the devil. . . . There can be nothing inherently sacred in any succession or combination of sounds. . . . In the diatonic scale there are no strictly pious intervals." But strange if music can lend itself to deviltry and yet not to divinity; and strange if aught of human expression, under what form soever, can be just the same toward God and devil. This is a musical infidelity which rouses me to wrath. And it is a hard thing for the human mind to hold; and even White, who has thought but loosely and spoken nonchalantly, has fallen from it. For he says elsewhere, "Music may awaken passion, good or bad, holy or unholy, as the case may be," which

Hosted by Google

surely are strange words about an art which he has said "has no point of contact with our moral nature."

But now I say there is music, moral, unmoral, and immoral. Gurney, a deep and tender writer on music, thinks that it stands not in direct relation to the morality of the listener, but only through its beauty, which may be greater or less; yet he says, "Morality tells in the production of all works." And, again, "A deep moral fervor, as in the case of Beethoven, may accompany and inspire the composer in his work; and it is doubtless the greater earnestness of character, as well as the greater mental capacity of the Teutonic race, which has led to the marvellous structural development of instrumental music in their hands." And the same writer declares that Beethoven's patient self-criticism and general moral superiority to Rossini, as one element out of many, take effect in his music. Now, this stands on the threshold of calling music a moral language, and, I fear, not to go in altogether. For what makes Rossini always Rossini, and Beethoven always Beethoven? By what do we know Shakspere's portions in "Timon of Athens" or "Henry VIII."? It is the difference of individuality. The whole composer, which is the whole man, has written the music, not this or that function or bit or part of him, called a faculty or sense. And from this wholeness of him, which is in his music, has the moral nature slipped out? And if, as Gurney has said, "morality tells in the production of the work," and greater earnestness of character has built itself a form in the grandeur of the German music, how can it be that unearnest music, by an unbraced composer, will not tend to unbrace the hearer and weaken him, and the more, the more it pleases? And how can it be that the work which has an architecture of earnestness will not inspire and strengthen the hearer according to its nature, and the more, the more it charms? Again, I say there is music, religious and unreligious and irreligious. And much that passes for religious is far from it, and is a worse deceit in the Church than Wamba in his friar's cowl; for it has as little sense, and is as little bred to the altar, and hath not his heart of love. It is thought, and the thought breeds many works, that, if words from the psalms or some hymn be set to any melody of like metre, sacred music is attained. Conversely, it is thought that if any Biblical poetry or prophecy be set by a composer with what mystery of his art he pleases, with runs and trills and turns and florid figures, sacred music is attained. Both these are wretched errors. For, if a composer be not touched and stirred by religious thoughts and feelings, how can he write music having the power of religious conveyance? One may paste a label of food on a poison, but the stomach is harmed. So one may call worldly-made music a prayer, and the ears take it innocently; but the heart is hurt. No church of my pastoring will ever have sung in it the so-called prayer from Rossini's "Moses in Egypt," because I know it to be no more a humble uplooking than if one were to recite a chivalric speech from Scott's "Lady of the Lake." Haydn wrote in the beginning of his scores *In nomine Domini* or *Soli Deo Gloria*, and at

Hosted by Google

the end *Laus Deo;* and, if he met with a difficulty in composing, he would leave his instrument and run over his rosary. He said, "The infinite goodness of the divine nature inspires me with such confidence and joy that I could have written even a *miserere* in *tempo allegro.*" How can it be that a composer so coming to his task must not impart a subtle quality to the music, emanating from such a state of mind, and that the quality will be religion in the music as first it was in the composer's soul? When White says that "in the diatonic scale there are no strictly pious intervals," it is foolish trifling. So there are no pious letters in the alphabet, either Hebrew or Roman; but they combine in David's psalms and in the English thereof.

Not like White speak the learned scholars in music. A recent historian of the great art, in a passage much too long to quote herein, recounts the devout reforming work in church music of the great Palestrina, and ends thus: "It is difficult to form any just idea of the beauty of this most perfect music without hearing it actually sung as Palestrina himself intended it to be sung, by a tolerably numerous choir of unaccompanied voices. The amount of learning displayed in its construction is almost incredible, yet the effect produced upon the hearer is that of extreme simplicity. And the reason of this is obvious. Ingenuity and learning are everywhere made subservient to beauty of expression, and beauty of expression to devotional feeling." And, in another place, of the great English Purcell the same writer says, "His services and anthems, though marked by a gravity of style which could only have been dictated by a devout appreciation of their intended purpose, display a boldness of invention for which we search in vain in the works of the best of his contemporaries." And, again, he says of the German Fux, "His church music is always remarkable for a breadth of design and a reverence of intention thoroughly worthy of its high object." In contrast, he records of Rossini, "He studied counterpoint at the Lyceum in Bologna under Mattei, but cared so little for it that, when the *maestro* said he had not learned enough to enable him to write church music, he simply asked, 'Can I write operas?' and, on being told that he knew enough for that, he declared himself satisfied, and refused to take any more lessons." From such criticism, we may learn that the language of music has a grandeur and simplicity which yet go coherently with the bravest use of harmony and melody. What is needed is simply pure and devout sincerity of intent. Where this is not, the music is a worldling, however it be dubbed with a religious name. If the music be writ with a motive to parade the construction or the ornaments, it is not religious; and even if the music have a solemn piety, and the singer be thinking of displaying his voice or execution, then there will be something unmatched, and an unholy channel for a holy stream, which will affect the hearer. Whosoever comes to sing a great prayer in music, with no religious motive, but only with a music motive, will show a voice unfit. I know not otherwise why some voices are

Hosted by Google

affecting, uplifting, regenerating, and others but shallow and unmoving, though musicians declare them unblemished in tone. There is more in voice than musical *timbre;* for the morality, the earnestness, and the love of a person affect it. This is why a large chorus of voices is the greatest of all vehicles for the holy music of religion; for, when voices enough are collected, each adds its own burden of religion and character, until it is as if it were not a man, but mankind, singing praises.

Possibly, it is the depth of sincere feeling living in noble music which accounts for beautiful performances among the less cultivated; for thorough devotion needs no learning, and consorts with simplicity. Since 1870, or thereabout, there has been a musical contest every year at the Crystal Palace, Sydenham, one feature of which is, among other prizes, a gold cup worth £1,000, to be held as a meed of honor for the year by the best chorus of more than three hundred voices which sings best certain prescribed music. The cup first was taken by a chorus of Welsh coal-miners, with their sisters, sweethearts, and wives, and held two years. And, when the cup was won from these Celtic colliers, it was not carried off by any highly cultivated competitors, but by a chorus of Yorkshire cloth-weavers.

I must bear urgent witness against the evil and mischief of setting sacred words to any tune of a like metre, and calling the bad compound religious. This is an old perversion. The Puritans sang psalms to hornpipes; and, lately, I met a record of a beautiful old English spring song, which long I have known as one of the oldest examples of part writing in any country, appearing in a mediæval manuscript, with a Latin hymn to the infant Jesus written in red ink under the secular glee-words of the English song. To my thinking, nothing good comes of this habit; and it is a happy chance if profanity be escaped. Could the noblest music alter the meaning of profane, obscene words? The union would be only a vile incoherence, like a Rebecca given to a Sir Brian. For example, the two words "Yankee Doodle" would fit rhythmically the magnificent strains of Händel's "Hallelujah Chorus"; but what of such a union? The thought is revolting, the act would be impious. But any more can holy words alter trivial or bacchanal or worldly music, written for florid execution or for feasts or for scenes or for passions? Not so. The music remains what it is, not made religious by pious syllables which hang on it,

> "Like those panels
> Of doors and altar pieces the old monks
> Painted in convents, with the Virgin Mary
> On the outside, and on the inside Venus."

It is much a habit thus to use love songs,—as one will hear Abt's shallow ditty sung to "Jesus, lover of my soul," because the metre fits; or as, though the music be much better, still the unfitness equal, one may hear Sarah Adams's hymn, "Nearer, my God, to thee," sung to the soft longing of "Robin Adair." There are love songs, indeed, that without

Hosted by Google

offence can be turned to religious use, because they utter lofty devotions which are the homages of soul to soul. I have heard such, and, hearing them, have thought the earth more glorious and the heavens wrapt closer about it. I think it not without meaning that the Welsh literature has just these two realms in it,— religion and love,— being composed wholly of hymns and love songs. All sides of literature are good; but, if a race develop only two, these two which the Welsh have are the combination for health, much better than religion and philosophy or than love and philosophy. But, also, there are love songs, whether in syllables or tones, which have not altitude to reach to religion. I have read a critic's verdict, that, as an amatory poet, Burns is unequalled. I will not pass on the judgment; yet I am sure that music which would express his love songs vividly, so as to be one with them, would not become worship by being fitted with a hymn. We have tried the experiment, unholily, in our psalmody, in the tune called "Smyrna," which, hearing, a teacher once cried out: "Do you call that a hymn tune? It is only some billing and cooing,"— in which he was right; for it is the "Batti, batti," of Mozart's "Don Giovanni."

Besides having holiness of purpose, religious music is strong music. I mean not learned or scientific; for, as devout religion may consort with simple and untaught people, so is it in music. But, however simple, true religious music never will be meaningless or paltry. I think it bad to take poor, uninspired, shallow melodies, and bring them to church and Sunday-school, because already they are known and sung, howbeit thoughtlessly and trivially. Some of my brothers are bound on this work; but I go not in with them to it, because I would lead the people away from common and worthless tunes to music of meaning and thought. To use tunes that are shallow for words that are noble, merely because the people have grown used to the tunes, is as if one were to speak in slang for the same reason. Slang is a vulgar jargon, whose trait is a maximum of application and minimum of specific sense; and so these shallow and worthless melodies called the Moody and Sankey, and other such like,— styled, in general, revival songs,— are vulgar babbles in tones, truly a kind of musical slang, because they have so little meaning,— a weak slang, withal, and not a bold expletive, which, at least, has force. But as slang cannot, with all its applications, be used in devotion, or to mention the same,— this being a stretch too much for it, as it cannot reach to high things without showing its mean nature the more,— so it is with this soulless music.

And as there is no lack of noble language in high and pure prophets, poets, preachers, teachers, whose words we may use at home, and especially in the church, rather than the jargon of the profane or trifling, so is religious music plentiful, holy, strengthening, and inspiring in high and pure composers, who, being masters of expression by inarticulate sound, like mighty spirits of a heavenly army at home in the whole arsenal of melodies and harmonies, have used these same resources for religion. Knowing how to express in music because they are great masters, they

Hosted by Google

have wrought religion into the same because they are devout souls. In oratorios and other church pieces written with devotional purpose by great composers, like Palestrina, who as little could fail of their purpose as Shakspere or Homer or Dante of their aim, we have such religious music, but for our congregational church use chiefly chorals, full of devotion and very simple, which have come down to us from many past generations, and often from grand masters, and which have the simplicity, depth, and fervor of the common heart with all the formal nobility of the grandest art, so that, indeed, there have been great musicians to whose minds the highest reach of their art was "the noble treatment of a choral."

I have yet another argument against unreligious music in the church; to wit, an economical one. There is a check on secular music in our churches,— music which in the church is an unholy and unblest intruder, like flaunting dress or masks. There is a check on this, I say; to wit, that it is beyond the congregation, and demands a choir. I have known the Canon in "Fidelio" sung in a church to some religious words, impiously and ignorantly set to it (for Beethoven knew how to put into the music what he meant by that same piece), and received with much delight and many praises of their singers by the rich church which paid the costly choir. And then was I happy to reflect that only trained singers were able to usher in this impiety, and that our churches, for the most part, are blessed with too great poverty to buy the profanation. Yet there are so many rich, and so many who strain beyond their means to do like the rich, that the evil is only checked, not killed, and still works its two evils, pride and sacrilege in the rich quarters where it is, and unhappy wishes in the poor quarters which have it not,— like unwholesome viands at a luxurious table, which make two heart-burnings, that of dyspepsia and that of envy. I say the necessity of a choir but checks the evil, not kills it, because so many choirs are had to replace with meretricious song the simple but noble devotional music which the congregation might sing. Wherefore there is a great waste of money. Now, a waste has two aspects. To have too much of anything for our means, how good soever it be, is waste. Therefore, to have something of which any quantity is too much, because it is bad, is a double waste, and adds wantonness to imprudence. Yet, with this double waste, we squander, every year, great sums of money, which fact I come at in this way. In our last Unitarian Year Book, I count three hundred and fifty-nine churches. From these, I have made three lists of churches: of those which I suppose spend $1,000 a year for their singers, forty-nine churches in all; and of those that spend, as I estimate, $2,000 a year for their singers, twenty-two churches in all; and of those that I think spend $3,000 a year for their singers, fourteen churches in all. These, all together, amount to eighty-five churches, surely not a very large proportion of three hundred and fifty-nine churches; yet, so as to be very sure, and to leave a very wide margin, I take but half of this number. Then I have twenty-four and a half churches spending $1,000, making $24,-

Hosted by Google

500 in the year; and eleven churches spending $2,000, making $22,000 in the year; and seven churches spending $3,000, making $21,000 in the year, — all together making a total of $67,500. Probably this sum is very much too small. I should place the sum at $100,000; for the $67,500, which very surely is paid, lacks but $32,500 of being $100,000. Now, deducting from the three hundred and fifty-nine churches the forty-two churches which pay the $67,500, we have left three hundred and seventeen churches. Now, to make the $32,500 to complete $100,000, it would need but that these three hundred and seventeen churches pay an average of $103 a year for their singing, which surely is a very small allowance, and probably under the fact rather than over, so that I doubt little that our Unitarian churches pay each year $100,000 for choirs to sing in them. But, if we take only the first sum, $67,500, paid by the richer churches which hire choirs at from $1,000 to $3,000 a year, how enormous is this sum! It is $24,000 more than the sum of the contributions of all the churches to the Unitarian Association, according to the last report of the treasurer. It is $2,000 more than the total of all items of the "proper receipts" of the American Unitarian Association for the last fiscal year, ending April 30. Here is the pit into which our missionary strength goes. If this great expense were incurred only for an over-supply of something good and useful to the churches, it would be bad enough; for, then, it would be selfish and a mere luxury, if thereby our missionary duty came to a stand-still, and Paul's words, "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel!" sounded vainly in pampered ears. But if, besides this, this great sum be spent for a profanity, to bring into the church a music which hath no church spirit in it, and is far apart from devotion, or even contrary to it,— this is a waste which has a double sadness, and shows once more the easy slip of selfishness into impiety.

In sum, brethren, if I be right in saying that music is a language which hath a religious store in it, and that there is religious and unreligious music, and moral and unmoral, take heed not to bring into our churches the unreligious, unmoral, unearnest; and beware lest we waste our substance for vanities which, in a world crying for help, are selfish indulgences, and which, hung about the altar, become profane.

Hosted by Google

CONGREGATIONAL SINGING.

BY REV. HENRY G. SPAULDING.

I HAVE been asked to speak of singing by the congregation as an act of public worship. The phrase "congregational singing" brings vividly before my mind two pictures. The first of these pictures is that of a large and handsome Unitarian church in the city of X., with seating capacity for five or six hundred worshippers. It has, on this bright Sunday morning of early summer, a congregation of less than one hundred. A showy voluntary on the organ is followed by the ambitious performance, on the part of the quartette choir, of an anthem, in which soprano, alto, bass, and tenor play for a while at a musical game of hide-and-go-seek, chasing one another up and down and across the scale, and then break forth at the close into a loud and confusing *Hallelujah, Amen*, that sounds like the college boys' "'Rah! 'rah! 'rah!" translated into music. After the Scripture lesson has been read, a hymn is given out with the customary preface, Let us *unite* in singing. The scattered listeners rise from their separated seats, and a few voices here and there struggle in vain to swim above the engulfing waves of organ tones and the flooding harmonies from the choir. To change the metaphor, the movement of these isolated singers may be compared to the attempt at marching made sometimes by a company of pickets when each soldier along the line is almost out of hearing as well as out of sight of his nearest comrade, yet all bravely advance "thorough bush, thorough brier," as the far-off bugler sounds the call. In like manner, our picket-worshippers in the vast, vacant spaces of the church advance in feeble and broken strains through the hymn in praise of that great Being to whose glory the morning stars *sing together*, and the countless wave-beats along the shore blend in the harmonious anthems of the sea!

My second picture is of another Unitarian church,— the pretty meeting-house in the village of Z. It is not a very large building; but in its chaste architecture there is a certain look of a religious home, bespeaking a family of worshippers. Every pew is filled, and *the children* are all there. As the church bells cease tolling, a member of the congregation quietly seats herself at the organ, and plays a simple voluntary of tender harmonies that invites to the peace and blessedness of the house of prayer and the day of rest. Then alternating with Scripture, prayer, and sermon, the whole congregation, with one accord, sing to the music of some grand old choral or devout tune of modern composer the hymns that voice their common faith and hope, their love and gratitude and praise. A peculiar and delightful feature of the service is the singing, after the prayer, of the

Hosted by Google

Lord's Prayer. This also, like the hymn, is sung by the entire congregation to appropriate music, in the form of a metrical chant. When this worshipping assembly leave their pews at the close of the meeting, their warm hand-shakings and neighborly greetings seem touched by the warmth and the glow of a vision seen from the Mount,— as when, at evening, the clouds that lie low down on the horizon shine with a radiance they have caught from the face of the God of Day.

These two pictures show us, in the first, how *not* to do it, and, in the second, the excellent, the ideal, and the *possible* way. For, if congregational singing is to be an enjoyable and a helpful exercise of public worship, there must be, in the first place, a worshipping congregation. By this phrase, I do not mean a few persons scattered about in the pews of a large church, however able or willing such an audience may be to join in sacred song. A congregation is a gathering together, a filling up of vacant spaces, an assembly that is compact enough to give each member of it the feeling that he is one atom of a united mass, one soldier of a solid regiment, marching to a common step, with shoulder touching shoulder and heart beating time with according hearts.

Then this compact assembly must be, in the true sense of the term, a *worshipping* congregation. If it is only an audience met to stare and to listen, letting both the eyes and the mind wander in prayer time, and hearing both the singing and the preaching with only a critic's ear; if, in other words, there is not the conscious purpose of taking part in the public worship of Almighty God and the conscious longing to acquire spiritual truth and receive fresh tides of the divine love and be baptized into a new spirit of consecration to duty,— then far better that no attempt be made at united singing. Worship is an offering, not an entertainment. It implies, on the part of the worshipper, some sort of sacrifice. We no longer lay upon the altar the smoking victim as the gift we make to the Heavenly Powers in token of our penitence or our thankfulness. But, unless we offer the "reasonable service" of repentant feelings and holy aspirations and consecrated wills, our so-called worship is an empty form, its music "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." Singing of any kind, under such conditions, is a perfunctory and joyless service, better done by proxy through a choir than attempted in a spirit of mock homage and unreality by the people. "An undevout astronomer," the old proverb says, "is mad." An undevout congregation, assembled to worship God, fails to reach the dignity of madness. It is simply silly.

But, given the congregation and the spirit of worship, there must next be the willingness of each and every one to do his part. We must sink the critic in the singer, push off from the rocks of our chilly individualism, and plunge boldly into the invigorating waves of swelling song. Congregational singing may not always be the most "artistic" kind of music; but, if there is a real union of hearts and voices, if people are *together* in spirit and together "in understanding" also, so far as this is possible, they

Hosted by Google

will be willing to give up that which is merely artistic for that which is truly inspiring; and they will probably find, in almost every instance, that in the hearty blending of many voices individual dissonances are swallowed up. It is not so much a general inability to sing as a fashionable unwillingness to sing that mars much of the congregational music now attempted in our churches, and often leads to its discontinuance altogether.

From these general considerations let me pass now to a few specific suggestions.

1. Good congregational singing demands preparation and requires practice. The preparation must come, of course, from teaching people how to sing. This is now done to a limited extent in our public schools and through private instruction. But not enough is done to secure the desired results. The old-fashioned country singing-school, encouraged by the church and often holding its sessions in the meeting-house, did very much to train a generation of singers who have nearly all passed off the stage and whose places are not filled. The church to-day can do nothing better in the direction of improving church music than to foster such schools of singing, to the end that a larger proportion of those who make up our congregations may be able to sing, and to sing well.

2. But, even where the great majority of the worshippers are fairly good singers, some sort of special *practice* is needed in the way of rehearsal. We do nothing well that is done by haphazard; and much congregational singing is only poor, when it might be very good, simply because nothing has been done, or even attempted, to make it good. Were I a settled pastor, I should encourage my people to meet at least once or twice a month for the study of hymns and the practice of tunes. At these meetings, I would, if possible, introduce some good instrumental music, with solos and part-songs to attract and give pleasure. Then, in some informal way, I would call the attention of those present to the rich stores of our modern hymnology and to the abundant supply that we now have of good hymn-tunes. And I am sure that through familiarity with the best gradually acquired, they would come in time to care for only that which is best; and hymns and tunes alike would be to them no longer as strangers whom they meet only at long intervals and know but for a passing moment, but would be from Sunday to Sunday like tried and trusted friends, whom to meet at any time is a joy and an inspiration.

3. But I would begin this good work at the beginning, and strengthen my building at the foundation. I would make the singing in the Sunday-school a preparation for that of the church. The natural reaction that has taken place from the somewhat dull music which was in vogue in our Sunday-schools a generation ago, and which both in the melodies and in the words that were set to them was unattractive to the children, has spent its force. It resulted, as reactions always do result, in an extreme of an opposite but equally offensive kind, so that a Sunday-school song came to be, and to a certain extent continues to be, the synonym of the poorest

Hosted by Google

sort of poetical platitude set to the cheapest musical jingle. We are now trying to mend this bad state of things; and we are fast coming to see that, in music as in poetry, a child will take to that which is of a high order, if it be at the same time truly simple, and will enjoy it and even love it much more readily than some good people are willing to admit. We can spoil the child's æsthetic sense with sugared melodies and smooth but meaningless verse as easily as we spoil his appetite with an excess of sweetmeats. But your healthy-minded boy or girl will soon learn to like the good poem or the good tune, while you teach it to him as if you liked it yourself; and you will find in all these æsthetic matters that the tree will be inclined very much as you have bent the twig. It would be a good plan for our Sunday-school children to learn by heart each year a few of the best hymns and tunes that are used by the congregation, so that such tunes as "Nicæa," "Bethany," "Old Hundred," "Italian Hymn," "Dennis," "Hursley," with at least two verses of the hymns that are usually sung to these tunes, might become a part of the devotional furniture of their minds, ready for use at any time or place, as familiar, indeed, as the strains of "Sweet Home" and "Auld Lang Syne."

This reference to hymns and tunes leads to a fourth suggestion.

4. If we would have good congregational singing, we must sift our hymns and winnow our tunes. We are using too many of both. Suppose a church holds forty services in a year, and sings three congregational hymns at each service. Better select thirty of the best hymns, each one always set to the tune to which it belongs, and then repeat these four times in the course of the year, than attempt, as is now so commonly done, to use seventy or eighty different hymns, with not much regard to their musical setting.

One grave objection to the prevailing method of using hymns is that we lose sight of the purpose for which a hymn should be sung. We should sing to the praise of God rather than for the mere edification of man. Music and poetry are *fine arts*, not exhortations or essays in disguise. Many preachers seem to think that a hymn should somehow let out beforehand the secret of their sermon subject. Under the specious plea of *unity* in the service, common prayer and public worship are disregarded; and the devotional exercises become only so many variations on the theme of the preacher's remarks. It would be far better to reverse this process, and fit the sermon to the sentiment of some grand hymn of praise or penitence or spiritual longing. Worship fails of its aim, if it is made the mere prefix and affix of a discourse; and a sermon is then most truly a sermon when it is a "lyric expression of the soul," as Martineau says preaching should always be. Let us not make a fetich of the rule which we learned in the Divinity School, that every service should have unity in its several parts. If rules are to guide us here, we can at least see as much artistic beauty and fitness in contrast as there is in similarity; and, when the discourse dwells upon the divine order manifested in nature, let the hymn address the Ordainer of nature's laws in lines like these: —

Hosted by Google

"While Thee I seek, protecting Power,
Be my vain wishes stilled;
And may this consecrated hour
With better hopes be filled."

5. As a corollary to the last statement, I would emphasize the importance of keeping a congregational hymn always to the same tune. If more than one composer has set the same words to music, then select that which is most in harmony with the devout and reverent intent of the hymn-writer. For why do we sing hymns when we would voice our adoration or bring our hearts into closer relations with the divine? Is it not that the devotional feeling of some kindred soul, which has found expression through the forms of poetic and musical art, may evoke, express, and deepen our own spiritual feelings? But, to do this, the tune, as well as the hymn, must be genuine art,— a "lyric of the soul." A good hymn set to unworthy music or a good tune accompanying a poor hymn defeats its own end. The house divided against itself cannot stand in art any more than in morals. And herein lies the reasonableness of the plea that more attention should be given to the quality of the tunes to which our hymns are set. Tunes that smack of the opera house or the festal board are utterly discordant with hymns that devout poets have written on their knees or when they lifted tearful eyes to the pitying heavens. Every chord in the harmony and every note in the melody of "Federal Street" thrills with the tender trust of its sainted composer who made his music utter the faith that was born of his own Christian experience, and is expressed in the words for which he wrote the tune: —

"See gentle patience smile on pain!
See dying hope revive again!"

And, in like manner, Monk's tune to Lyte's hymn, "Abide with Me," is the plaintive musical cry of the believer's soul to Him with whom it longs to hold communion and be at rest. It is a strange perversion of our modern Unitarian hymns which would marry liberal religious poetry to the Moody and Sankey tunes! Even in evangelical circles, this sort of claptrap music is being discarded as the veriest rubbish,— unworthy of a place in the devotions of intelligent Christians.

We need a reformation of much of our current psalmody,— first, in the interest of pure art; for art is pure only when the pure soul blossoms naturally into picture, melody, or poem. And we need this reformation also in the interest of religion, which is never truly served by art save when all her servants are true priests of the Most High, and swing in unison their worship-laden censers.

But, it will be asked, does it so much matter, after all, whether we worship at church, by singing ourselves or by letting others sing for us, especially if they sing much better than we can hope to do?

Of the respective merits of choir singing and congregational singing, I cannot speak at any length. Nor is there any need that I should do so,

Hosted by Google

since the function of the choir has already been ably discussed by another in this series of addresses. Speaking for myself, I would utter no wholesale or indiscriminate denunciation of church choirs. We may worship by proxy in song as well as in prayer. If we could not, then hard, indeed, would be the fate of those who must be content to live as "voiceless singers," and die with all their music in them, waiting for a heavenly unfolding of their latent powers! But, knowing well whereof I speak,— since for the larger part of my life I was choir singer, choir leader, and organist,— I must utter here my emphatic protest against that too common kind of choir singing which is wholly at variance with the aim and purpose of a service of public worship. The difficult and, in some cases, almost insoluble problem of having the right kind of church choir consists in this: men and women, who are hired to sing for a church, too often render this service from no other motive, and with no other object, than to get their salaries, and perhaps increase their reputation as musical artists. They are like hired mourners in a funeral procession, whose grief is but a mock sorrow, and who show to every looker-on that, though they follow behind the weepers, it is not their funeral. Did the minister, who is also a hired servant of the church, take as little interest in its work and its worship as some of these paid singers manifest, he would be speedily removed from his sacred office. I gladly acknowledge that there are some salaried choirs whose members are as much *en rapport* with the worship when they sing as is the most devout minister when he prays. Still, I would urge that, if a choir must be had to supplement or supplant the singing of the congregation, it should be, if possible, a chorus choir, made up of devout persons who are themselves a part of the congregation. Longfellow's village blacksmith hears at church his daughter's voice

> "Singing in the village choir,
> And it makes his heart rejoice.
> It sounds to him like her mother's voice,
> Singing in Paradise!"

When all our choir singers are, both in body and in spirit of our own kith and kin, our fellow-workers and our fellow-worshippers, then, whether we listen to them or join with them, the singing will be our common service of glad thanksgiving, and our souls will be lifted heavenward on "mighty pens" of poesy and of song. The conclusion of the whole matter may be briefly stated: Have congregational singing wherever it is possible. Have a choir, if it is needed, to lead this singing or to add to it from the rich treasuries of sacred composition that devout musicians have given to the Church. But, with all your getting, *get that which makes for true worship*. Let the people who assemble for praise and prayer and holy meditation on things divine receive, in the house of God, those blessed influences which sacred music meditates,— influences that fill the heart with joy, the home with love, and the common duties of the daily life with visions of heaven and the voices of the Spirit.

Hosted by Google

THE CHOIR.

BY REV. WILLIAM H. LYON.

THE river Reuss flows through one of the wildest valleys of Switzerland. Enormous gray cliffs rise on either side. White cascades dash down through their clefts; while, even in pleasant weather, ragged clouds drift by, now revealing their height, now challenging the imagination to guess it. But even here, in the very heart of natural grandeur, it is the river that seems the centre and reason of the whole scene. For it the mountains seem to gather moisture; for it the clouds form; for it the eager streams rush down the precipices; for it the cliffs put their feet together to make a channel. It seems like the life-blood of nature itself pouring down into the world of man.

But, as it flows on, its enthusiasm seems to abate. The foam lessens, the green, smooth places enlarge, till, finally, it settles down into the staid and plodding river Rhine. When at last it flows through the Palatinate and then through Holland, it is broader, indeed, but not only less dashing, but of far less importance in the landscape. Its stream, muddied by the soil it has washed from its surroundings, is valued by the tourist chiefly for its historic associations and its picturesque setting. The business world, scorning its trivial distinctions of overshot and undershot and breast-wheels, finds a better power for manufacture and for conveyance in modern steam. So men fill up its superfluous shallows, and hem in its currents with dykes and embankments; while, for taste's sake, they plant its borders with avenues of poplars and trim green lawns.

Not unlike this has been the history of the Christian Church. It begins with a life so energetic, so free from outward control or contribution, that it seems a spontaneous outgrowth from the nature of things. Moses in Midian, David in the sheep pastures, Elijah in his cave, Jesus in the wilderness and on the mountains, and Paul in Arabia seem to have some deep and vital connection with the world around them.

> "Out of the heart of Nature rolled
> The burdens of the Bible old."

And the new life which flows from these elementary sources dashes on, at first, with a freedom and enthusiasm almost tumultuous,—a law unto itself. For centuries, the central fact in history is the Christian Church. For it seem to exist the united world, the great framework of Roman law, the wide-spread Greek language, the military roads, the universal peace.

But its current, though it seems to broaden, flows less swiftly, and with

Hosted by Google

less outward energy. Its clear current is muddied with the worldliness which it has caught from the interests through which it flows. Other elements of civilization rival and, in some respects, displace it. The awakened intellect scorns its petty distinctions between doctrines which are all insignificant. The revived secular life, the printing-press, the embodiment of its best ideas in political and social ethics, reduce it from the central institution of the world to be but one of many. Not a few still love it for its historical associations or for the picturesque sentimentalism which hangs about it. But its once tumultuous enthusiasm, where it has not sobered down of itself into a smooth and respectable propriety, is held in bounds by stiff conventionalisms. Instead of giving the law to social ideas and customs and tastes, they give the law to it; and, while men tenderly surround it with all the comforts, conveniences, and ornaments which a moneyed and æsthetic age can provide, by these very elegances they seem to try either to make up for a lost enthusiasm or to guard against outbreaks of it, which would now bore them where once they would have roused them.

Of these ornamental curbs or substitutes with which a critical and unenthusiastic age surrounds its religion, three are especially prominent,— the manuscript sermon, the liturgy, and the choir.

When the preacher has begun to lose consciousness of a special message, to think less of what he is to say and more of how he is to say it, less of his Bible and more of his Blair,— in a word, when the preacher turns into the sermonizer, then comes the correct and polished manuscript in place of the tongue of fire, the study of rhetorical strategy instead of the sturdy bayonet charge of man down upon man.

When, again, prayer has become a respectability rather than a necessity, and the congregation lets the flame of worship die out upon the family altar, and hands over its direct transactions with the Almighty entirely to the broker in the pulpit; and when, feeling the fire of prayer low in him, too, and themselves the victims of his personal moods or his pious wordiness or his conscious "gift of prayer," they find it necessary to write out his petitions for him, and confine his rantings or ramblings within an elegant ecclesiastical fence of early English pattern,— then comes the liturgy.

And when the spirit of grateful and adoring worship begins to flag, and its on-dashing current no longer feels the need of breaking out into personal expression and the glad communion of many voices; when the stream of personal piety disappears under that of musical taste,— then the congregational song dies away, and its privilege is surrendered to the more correct proxy of the choir.

The choir has always been the sign of decreased religious life in the church. When Christianity was young and vigorous, it sang its own hymns, from the time when the Master and his faithful eleven sang that pathetic psalm around the table of the Last Supper, and the enthusiastic

Hosted by Google

gathering of his disciples at Jerusalem had their music, like their goods, in common. Choirs came in with the other pomps and glories of a successful but worldly church. And, as every brook that joins the quiet Rhine comes down its hillside singing, but is soon silenced in the placid current of the great river, so every fresh stream of Christian life — Lollardism, Lutheranism, Methodism — has come with spontaneous congregational singing, only to have it at last drowned in the complacent silence of the general current. And so to-day, whenever a great preacher fills his crowded congregation, not only with ethical instruction, but also with religious life, then congregational hymns become as natural as speech to the lover or song to the bird.

This is not to say, however, that the choir is not needed, still less that it is injurious. It is not its existence, but its necessity, that marks the languor of religion. It is not that the congregation *do* not sing, but that they *cannot* or *will* not sing, that is the grievous fact. There is no reason why professional singing should not find place in public worship as well as professional speaking. There can be prayer and preaching in song as well as in speech; and, in both cases, training may be necessary. To have heard Madame Patti sing, "Oh, rest in the Lord," from the "Elijah," or Madame Albani, "I am he that liveth," or Parepa, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," is to have been touched as one rarely is by a sermon. The choir may be made of very great service to our worship. Protestantism has never yet understood the connection of music with religion. The Protestant choir music is usually not an element, but an ornament in worship, one might almost say a relief from the other elements, or even a compensation for them. The Catholic music is commonly an integral part of the worship. The Protestant music is a pretty fountain that tinkles pleasantly in the ear. The Catholic music is a tide that lifts the soul. And yet it is just in our Protestant churches that music is most needed. Our services tend to dry intellectuality. The emotions wither. But music is the language of emotion, especially of the finer and deeper kinds. Vocal music abstracts from human speech just those tones which make the difference between a dry precise statement and that statement warmed and colored by affection, or sadness, or hope, or joy. Hence, you cannot sing a creed; but you can sing the faith or repentance there is in it. You cannot put the five points of Calvinism into music; but its sorrow over man's sin, and its joyful recognition of Christ's goodness, and awe at God's justice can come flowing out into song. The dogmas are left behind as the fair Rhine leaves the glaciers stranded on the bleak mountains. Hence, the need of devout singers increases with the increase of controversial preaching or scientific demonstration in the pulpit. The more doctrinal or intellectual the preacher, the more demand for the gentle ministry of music to the heart. If the preacher must demolish Orthodoxy or heresy, disprove the Trinity or Universalism, then let the true singer address those emotions which are not of this church or that alone, but of all good mankind.

Hosted by Google

There is a place and a demand, then, for devout singing in our public worship. The difficulty is very much the same as occurs with the pulpit, to get singers who are as devout as they are skilful and who will sing to the soul as well as to the ear. The time may come when, like the Master, we shall ordain our ministers two by two, one to preach and the other to sing the gospel. Or, perhaps, we can solve in this way the great problem of what to do with that idle and useless personage for whom parishes try so hard to find something to do,— the minister's wife.

It must often have occurred to the thoughtful hearer that it would be better to take the money which is spent sometimes upon the four unsatisfactory singers which custom seemed to demand, and secure one superior singer with it. In my "Church in Spain," I hear a simple alto voice, clear, sweet, unpretending, and pathetic,— best of all voices for the church, — singing a hymn or sacred song so that my sermon falls upon ground already softened. The objection to the single voice would be the lack of variety. It might be answered that it was bad enough to have to listen to one voice preaching Sunday after Sunday, without also having one voice to sing. But this could be obviated, at least in cities, by a frequent change of the singer, so that really a greater variety could be secured than we have already, with always the same four voices. Or, perhaps, our singers could "exchange," like the ministers.

Another experiment in variety is sometimes made with the male quartet. In some respects there is nothing better than male voices for religious effect. There is a strength and solidity in them which express well the emotions of awe or reverence or sadness or even faith. At a funeral or any other occasion of sorrow, there is nothing more touching and at the same time so reassuring and strengthening. In almost any church, the substitution of two male voices for the two female, now and then, in the usual mixed quartet, would make an agreeable change. But, for some reason, perhaps the lack of range and variety, male singing has never become well domesticated in our churches.

More common, and yet less so than it should be, is the chorus choir. First, let us speak of the boy-choir. It will never become common with us, because, if it is good for anything, it must be very good; and to make it very good requires more pains and expense than most churches can give. And yet nothing sweeter or brighter was ever brought to the worship of God than a well-trained choir of boys. They are like a spring of water, clear, pure, sparkling, and refreshing. All the buoyancy and hopefulness of the boy nature are in their voices, and they come with reviving power to those in whom the enthusiasms of youth have grown languid. It is not only in those great cathedrals into which the English Church has crept like an English sparrow into a robin's nest, but in many parish churches both in England and here that one learns the beauty and vigor of the boy choir. In two of our churches in Birmingham, England, it is used with great success, the common people especially hearing it gladly;

Hosted by Google

and at least one minister, who has heard the one in Rev. Stopford Brooke's church in London, has dreamed ever since of the one he means to have some happy day.

Perhaps more practicable is the chorus of the young men and women taken from one's own people. The difficulties are very great, as some of us who have tried the experiment can testify. It is far easier to hire four ready-made singers who must always be on hand than to manage twenty or thirty kindly but irresponsible and inexperienced young folk. They have many social engagements, and they shun anything that looks like confinement to a fixed task. But, in the smaller towns and in the country, at least, it ought to be possible to organize a musical club, which, besides helping very much in entertainments, shall be the choir on Sunday. The advantages are great. They are your own people, interested in the church at least; and they ought to be made interested in the religion for which it stands. If they are gathered about a trained quartet, they can strengthen it in some parts of the anthem, and always they can give stirring and sustaining vigor to the congregational singing.

Two weeks ago Sunday night, I was struck by the superb power and spirit of the congregational music in a comfortable parish church in Cambridge, England. It was all due to the fresh and joyful singing of a volunteer choir of young men and women, who, sitting near the organ, in front, in one of the transepts, carried everything with them. They would have made a Quaker sing. It was no wonder that the church was full, especially with young people, and that young men and maidens, old men and children, joined in praising God. It seemed as if no amount of thought and labor could be too great to spend in making our own services as wide awake and living as that. Surely, there is many a village church in which it could be done. The expense could not be great, for there is abundance now of cheap and good music for just such cases. The existence of such a club in the town, with a skilful leader, would be of great good to the community at large; while the young people themselves would not only be glad of the social opportunities and of the chances to do something for their church, but would have a religious training which is not to be despised.

But, after all our ideals and preferences, we shall probably have to deal, in most churches, with that useful but unsatisfactory quadruped,— the mixed quartet. It is useful, because it is so easily secured, and because its combination affords a pleasant variety and range of voices. But it is unsatisfactory, because it cannot meet the profoundest needs of public worship. It does well, and would do better, if it could. Few ministers have ever failed to find their choirs ready to respond to any suggestion which they have made, and eager to know how they can do their part in making the service truly religious. But the difficulty is inherent and unavoidable. The quartet, though of best material, may be sweet, tender, sympathetic, and so consoling,— how often we have had to thank them for

Hosted by Google

their helpfulness to this side of life!—but it cannot uplift or inspire, nor arouse those emotions of awe, veneration, or solemn adoration which make so profound a part of religion. It can make us resigned to our life; but it cannot make us feel that our life is hidden in God, and merged in the Infinite Wisdom, Love, and Power. See how the organ, so grandly satisfying when allowed its full scope, has to dwarf itself and walk almost mincingly, when it has to accompany the quartet!

But here the quartet is, and very thankful we are for it sometimes. Let us see how we can make it serve us still better.

Three things we must ask of it.

First, that it let us understand its words. It was one of the first demands of the Reformers that worship should be conducted in the language of the people. Out went the Latin from the chancel, but in the choir a language quite as unintelligible has persisted; and the anthems and chants are as dark to the congregation as ever Vulgate or Breviary was. It is not necessarily the fault of individual singers. Sometimes, it is unavoidable; but, chiefly, it is due to methods of teaching by which pronunciation is utterly sacrificed to purity of tone. If Baal were as easy to sing as Lord, we should doubtless have it on the high notes. Sometimes, the experiment has been tried of reading the words of the anthem before they are sung. But it savors rather too much of the showman, or of those unskilful but kindly young artists who write under their drawings, "This is a horse," "This is a cow." The remedy must come from the singers, and through the inexorable demand of the music committee.

Secondly, we ask from our singers *simpler music.* We do not want those complicated anthems in which the singers wind in and out among the mazes of their parts like Laocoön and his sons among the serpents, and come out at last smiling and breathless, like an acrobat who has been tying himself into knots. Neither do we want those solos which are made to display the utmost limits of their voices, upon whose giddy verge they balance themselves as upon poles, while we admire and tremble. In the name of common sense, my dear Miss Squallini, keep those rocket notes of yours and those astonishing roulades for your hours of practice, and don't forget to shut the windows then. And you, most excellent Herr Profundo, do not roll down that awful scale of yours, like a barrel down the cellar stairs. For, lo! the thing we command you is not in heaven that you should climb to bring it down to us, neither is it in the deep that you should descend to fetch it. But the word is very nigh you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you should do it very easily. Sing as you sang to us the other night, when you sat down to the piano in the twilight and gave us "Annie Lawrie" and "Ben Bolt" till our hearts were as soft as wax in your hands. Give us simple hymns or tender, sacred songs in which you forget yourselves, as you want the minister to forget himself in prayer and sermon.

Already we are making our third demand, that the singing be sincere

Hosted by Google

as well as musical. The choir are priests as well as the minister, and their office also is to touch the heart and soul. When once they feel this, they will not need to be cautioned against affectations. It is much to expect this of singers who are hired only for their voices' sake, and have little personal interest in the people to whom they sing. But it must be done before the choir fully deserves a place in our worship. In the mediæval days, when the Psalmista was invested with his singing-robes, the Presbyter said to him, "See that what thou singest with thy mouth thou believest also in thy heart." And that is our chief demand from the church singers of to-day.

Hosted by Google

THE ORGAN IN CHURCH.

BY ARTHUR FOOTE.

A DAY or two ago I was talking with one of the best organists in the country, who is an enthusiast about the possibilities of the organ in church, but decidedly a pessimist as regards the present state of things. He expressed the wish that another convention might be held at Saratoga simply to discuss this one subject,— what the organ can do for the church service,— and felt that it was quite important enough to justify it. That is rather an exaggerated view, but seems less so when one thinks of adequately treating the question in these few minutes.

I do not feel that I can enlarge properly on any point, and shall only attempt to say a word on a few matters that must be constantly in the mind of every organist who cares for and respects his calling. If I seem, perhaps, to make too much of the organ and organist as factors in the church service, it is because their importance is often underestimated. A good organist can be of as much help in making things what they should be, as a bad one is too generally a hindrance.

With all our churches, from the most prosperous ones in the great cities to the small struggling outposts in the remotest parts of the country, *needs* more than keep pace with income, and we have the ever-present problem,— how best, with a small amount of money, to obtain a good organ, organist, and choir; and more, being given these, how to make the best use of them.

It is not strictly within my province to say anything about the choir. This, however, it is fair to insist upon: that much more will depend upon the organist than is generally acknowledged. A good choir and poor organist (even if he can really *play the organ well*) will not combine to give good results. It is like a railroad, well built and well equipped, but not well managed. We can all guess what that will result in. What is good to start with will be neutralized by incompetence, and will finally degenerate, so as to be not even good in itself.

For the organist must not only play the organ, but must also be competent in many other ways. The fitness of what is sung and played to go with the rest of the service is, and ought to be, the result of his taste and knowledge. No individual singer can force things to go as they ought, as any organist can do, if he will, and if his singers have learned to respect his authority. For one thing, he sees the music as a whole; while the singer attends generally only to his own part, and is absorbed in it. Again, "knowledge is power"; and the organist will nearly always be the

Hosted by Google

one person best educated and trained musically. In fact, it has to be so; for, with the organ, nothing can possibly take the place of the necessary hard work and study, while, with the singer, the possession of a beautiful voice may too often make the case quite the reverse. Pronunciation, expression, and the various details of performance can be far better looked after by one who is listening, as the organist is, than by one who is singing, and therefore can but half listen. It will illustrate this point best, perhaps, if I refer to the fatal habit of all bodies of singers (whether small or large) of slowing up, more or less, in a doleful way, at the end of a verse of a hymn, especially if that be sung rather softly, and most of all when without accompaniment. That can be checked only from outside, or by the organ. If left to itself, it goes from bad to worse. It is hard to believe, by one who has not seen it practically proved, how much the influence of the organ, for good or for ill, is felt by the singers.

The sum of this is, then, that more must be required of the organist than of any one else, and that he must be the one responsible person. Otherwise, we may get along, indeed, and do fairly well, but can never obtain such results as we ought to be trying for.

What should be the qualifications of the organist?

It is of course taken for granted that he shall be musically entirely competent, and, if possible, experienced in church work; if he be not experienced, at least quick to learn and to adapt himself. For mere experience should not be too much insisted upon: a clever young organist will very quickly become more valuable than an experienced bad one of many years' standing.

Besides this, he will not be good for very much, unless he be thoroughly interested in his work, and unless he can co-operate heartily with the "other end of the church," as we say.

To do that well demands a sympathetic as well as a musical nature, and, it need hardly be said, requires something quickening from the minister also, or all will be unhelpful and useless. It is good to think that doctrinal tests are not required from our organists; but they should at least be thoroughly interested in their church work, and not look on it merely as a way to get money and to work another day of the week. Their work will not be of much worth unless their hearts be in it.

In one of the most successful musical services that I have known (it is in Boston), the musical selections (excepting, perhaps, the opening one) are always left undetermined until the drift and purpose of the minister's part of the service are understood by the organist. He then always picks out what the choir shall do, thus supplementing what is said by what is sung, the result being a perfect pleasure to all who come, whether on religious or musical thoughts intent.

From the infrequency of such a really ideal service, it would seem to call for an unusual man, or rather two of them; but this is not really the case. All that is necessary is the desire for such a service, good taste, and fair ability. It is oftenest the desire that is lacking.

Hosted by Google

In exact contrast to this is the ordinary so-called "Vespers," — a collection of effective scraps of all sorts, and an offence to the real musician as to the real worshipper. It is made more tolerable by being based on a regular form of worship (for instance, the modification of the Episcopal evening service, which has been introduced in some churches), but, at its worst, an abomination. The truth is, however, that a congregation generally likes it, and not unnaturally; for it is, at any rate, a striving after life and color in the service, even when the result has much in it to be condemned.

There is, however, one other form of vespers that immediately commends itself. It has not been commonly done, but needs only to be spoken of to be taken up with interest.

It is this,— to base the entire service on some well-known character or story from the Old or New Testament, that has been set to music in a worthy way, as "The Messiah," "Elijah," "St. Paul," "The Woman of Samaria," "The Prodigal Son," etc. There are a great many oratorios and cantatas from which a choice can be made. We may then start with that as a foundation, the music fitting in to what the minister has to say, illustrating it, and sending it home; while, simply as a vesper service, it will be better and more effective than any ordinary form. Here, again, we are brought back to the necessary sympathy and mutual support of the two ends of the church. In the better sort of organist's work, so much seems to depend upon and result from that.

There are certain bad customs that, in the course of many years, have become traditions in organ playing. The worst of them is the habit of expecting every organist to improvise, at any moment and at any length, apropos of anything. Now, a man who can improvise music worth listening to is as rare as, or rarer than, one who can make a really good extemporaneous address. It is reasonable that it should be so, for it requires an even greater exceptional gift. Most improvising is surely less interesting and helpful than the standard music of the great or even lesser masters. Just think of the depths to which it often descends,— of the scraps from operas and popular songs imperfectly remembered. Good improvising is, like a fine, off-hand speech, electric; the ordinary kind, like one that is halting, disconnected, and pointless, without a central idea, unpleasant to listen to.

When you do find an organist with the really precious gift, prize it; but, while there is such an enormous mass of legitimate organ music, do not encourage the habit of stringing together platitudes and stale reminiscences in music any more than elsewhere. Do not expect your organist to begin playing at the hour announced for the service, and to continue until the church looks full, or the minister goes into the pulpit, or the bell stops ringing, or the belated member of the choir arrives. He will then, without written music, merely play comparative rubbish on and on; and the more of it he does, the better it will seem to him. It is like any bad

Hosted by Google

habit. We organists are not a class apart for conceit; but it must be admitted that many of us believe that we have the gift of thinking good music, and plenty of it, as soon as we can get our fingers on the key-board. Discourage it all that you can.

Another unreasonable tradition (come from no one knows where) is that the playing shall be *soft* at the beginning of the service and *loud and lively* at the end. Why? I grant that a quiet voluntary is oftenest suitable for introducing the usual religious service; but is it not even more so for ending it? How frequently the mood in which we are left is totally disturbed and destroyed by a noisy postlude! What, for example, after a hymn, a prayer, and a benediction, is the sense of a brilliant march like that from Mendelssohn's "Athalie"? Surely, the most fitting thing will be music that in some sort continues and helps our frame of mind. It is a mood that is only too easily spoiled. The music is there for comfort and aid,— not to accelerate our steps from the house of God. On a point like this, the minister's counsel will be of great use. The voluntaries are integral parts of the service, and he can influence them in the right direction.

It was always a comfort to me, and a strong hint as well, when Dr. Rufus Ellis would stop to speak to us of something that we had done in the choir that seemed to help his work; and he always did take pains to speak of it. Believe me, you ministers can do what you choose with any organist in that way, if you will take the trouble. The difficulty we have is to know what is wanted and what we ought to do, and for any help toward that we are grateful to minister, congregation, or committee.

This last word suggests another interesting topic, on which many dubious jests have been made; namely, the music committee. I shall wait for those who have had queer experiences to tell of them. I have none to tell. But, from what I have seen in other churches, I must say that it seems more desirable for the control of the music to be in the hands of the usual business committee than in any other. It may be safely asserted that the business point of view is the true one; that choir and organist are contracted with to do a certain work and to furnish a certain definite thing; and that, when incompetence or insubordination shows itself, it must be met and checked in the "business way." This is easiest done by such a committee. Through the committee may come the suggestions and the criticisms of the congregation to add to the sympathetic counsels of the minister. He hears from the congregation rather the other and more important side,— about services, sermons, church work of all kinds; and what he says about the musical part will be too likely to reflect only his own feelings, and not to be helped or influenced from outside.

In what comes now, we can only have in mind tolerably large and well-to-do churches; but it is a question that raises itself constantly in the mind of any organist worth his salt.

Why cannot the *plan* of our musical services be improved?

Hosted by Google

I do not mean by such makeshifts as the conventional vespers. But, there being no rule of the church forbidding innovations, why must we always cling to the old-fashioned service of an organ voluntary, an anthem, and a couple of hymns, or even to the newer style of anthem, Te Deum, Jubilate, hymns, etc.?

Think what we miss in not being able to use the splendid masses of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and the new composers, and of the much larger and loftier uses that might be made of the organ as a solo instrument. For example, there is surely nothing out of place in an appropriate organ solo, even a long one, in the *middle* of the service.

No one who has been at the great churches in Paris, where Catholic music is heard in its highest and most perfect development, can but have been impressed by the magnificent and truly religious effect produced by the great organ at the end of the church, which has been silent since the beginning of the service (the other small organ being used with the choir all the time),— by this great organ finally bursting out with a flood of sound, exalting and sustaining the listeners as nothing else can. I have never witnessed that, without contrasting it with the meagre musical and religious results (for it must be insisted upon that they go together) that our service produces, often because it does not attempt to unite religious and artistic aims. That requires, to be sure, an uncommonly good organist, and a second small organ, besides the usual one. Granted! But those are conditions that can be fulfilled by our large and prosperous churches, and it would be emphatically worth while to try. There is no doubt that such a service will most completely satisfy the real, serious musician; and what pleases him will almost always meet the religious conditions that may be imposed. At any rate, an ordinary service, as we have it now, is very far from accomplishing its mission. It is time for those churches that can do so to try and set a worthier and a higher standard. Others will follow, if they will only lead.

The quality of music in churches is undeniably better than formerly; but we stay in ruts, and the old methods remain pretty much as they were.

It must be granted that this is largely the fault of organists. They are too content to go on in the same conventional way (it is much more comfortable), and do not disturb themselves to try to see how matters can be improved. And they can be, and must be, if there is to be any growth in the musical life. Our usual religious service, from its not being definitely settled by law or decree, ought to be easily susceptible of change and improvement; but, from constant habit and custom, it seems to get as rigid and unyielding as the most uncompromising forms of the Catholic or Episcopal Churches.

If your organist has any ideas that may benefit the service, assume that it is possible to discuss them. They may have good in them, and anything that really improves the musical side will do nothing else than that for the whole. Variety in the music will bring the rest out in relief, and make it

Hosted by Google

tell for more. It will interest the congregation more, and in a legitimate way, against which nothing can be said. Let us make the most of our liberty, and not let custom choke life and feeling.

An important and much discussed matter is the position of the organ in the church. Shall it be behind the pulpit, or on the side of the church, or at the opposite end? down on the floor, or up high on the wall?

To me, it seems preferable to have it, at any rate, not behind the pulpit, and even not near it. For a long time, the antiphonal sort of service has been recognized as having peculiar merits. There is a something in the answering of one body of singers to another, and of one end of a building to the other end, that appeals especially to almost every one. It, at any rate, produces an effect, and of a good sort.

How much more impressive is a chant divided between two choirs! and the reading of the psalms, or any portion of the service, when the congregation and the minister have it alternately! This is the real argument for having the pulpit and the organ at a distance from each other, and it is a valid one. As for the other question — whether the organ shall be on a level with the floor or high up on the wall (twenty or thirty feet, at least) — there are two practical reasons for its *not* being on the floor.

One is that an organ seldom or never sounds at its best without plenty of room to speak in, with space on every side. This it will have, if high up on the wall, and almost never, if it be placed on the floor and in a corner, as it would be.

In the second place, if on the floor, it will often be placed directly over a damp, cold cellar. Then, being surrounded by much warmer air, it will surely be out of tune almost all the time. It should be remembered that a variation of even five degrees in the temperature of the air inside the organ is enough to throw it quite out of tune. This point is of even more importance than it seems to be, for many an organ has turned out a comparative failure for this simple reason.

And now come various practical questions of great interest and moment to any church, and especially to those at a distance from the great cities, and most important of all to those having but little money.

First, "What sort of an organ to get?"

The answer to that is, "If possible, get an *organ*." I mean, don't get a makeshift, if it can be helped, but a pipe organ. A very tolerable one may be got for less than a thousand dollars, although every hundred dollars added to the cost means more than that amount in improved results.

From any of the good organ builders, you can get detailed specifications of all sorts of large and small organs, beginning at, perhaps, five or six hundred dollars.

When this preliminary statement of plans is in your hands, it will be best to submit it to some authority, to see if you are really going to get your money's worth, and this with a good American builder one generally

Hosted by Google

does. Have every agreement made exact and specific,— for example, an open diapason stop, of such a material, with so many pipes, etc. Have the sum of money paid include the setting up of the organ in place, under the supervision of a competent workman. The position and setting up of the organ are of a great deal more importance than it would seem to be at first thought. Allow more room always than seems to be absolutely necessary. An organ that is huddled together as best may be will be a comparative failure. That was one trouble with the Boston Music Hall organ. Even for a remote church, it is not difficult to have a competent man sent from the factory to look after all this. A few months ago, I had the pleasure of looking over and certifying to an organ that was to go from Boston to Oregon. The firm that made it, owing to certain other engagements, were able to send one of their best workmen after it, to see that it was properly set up, at no greater expense to the church than a man from San Francisco would have been. Of course, this is an extreme case; but a reputable builder will go to any lengths to have his work done justice to in that way.

Having your organ, do not expect your organist to be also a tuner, as a matter of course. If you are at too great a distance from a professional tuner, you may indeed insist that the organist shall learn thoroughly how to tune, and pay him for doing it. But many organs are half-ruined by their organists trying to keep them in tune, without knowing how; and keeping the organ properly in tune is only next in importance to the buying of it.

A very small point, but of consequence, is this: that if, when you buy the organ, you have not as much money as you ought, room can be left in it for further stops to be added as more money comes in. That is very often done by builders, but will naturally not be, unless you foresee it yourself. It amounts, to be sure, to having the organ not more than three-quarters finished at first; but such a course will often prevent bitter disappointment, and never be a mistake.

With these few commonplace, practical hints, I shall close, remembering that with regard to organs and organists there is seldom danger in insisting on the practical side.

The sum of it all is: get a good organ and a good organist, and then expect much from him, but also assist him all that you can. That is the way to have the musical part of the church really help in the worship of God. It too often drags us down; but it may just as easily raise us up, and combine with sermon and hymn to make a reverential whole.

Hosted by Google

THE WOMEN'S AUXILIARY CONFERENCE.

THROUGH the illness of the President of the Women's Auxiliary Conference, Miss A. W. May, the opening address of the meeting held at Saratoga, September 22, was delivered by the Vice-President, Mrs. S. T. Hooper.

A hearty greeting was extended to the members of the Conference, and its work was reviewed since its organization in 1880, showing that there was great cause for encouragement in the increased interest and activity of the women of our churches throughout the country, and in the strong and effective co-operation with the National Conference, with the American Unitarian Association, and with each other.

We have gained much in religious knowledge, and with it a consciousness that such knowledge is needful for our young people.

This missionary work can be best accomplished by forming auxiliary branches throughout the country. Let the few in every society or place who are ready for active church work organize, and they will soon find their numbers increased, and their hands strengthened by other willing workers.

The special objects of interest mentioned at the last Conference were all shown to have met with success in their work. The Santa Barbara church is in a prosperous condition, also that at Littleton, N.H., and at Ithaca, N.Y. The Prospect Hill School has been put in excellent order. A Bureau of Southern and Indian Educational Work has been established; and it is hoped that the different branches will each become familiar with its work, and help to sustain it.

The South End Industrial School was mentioned, and the importance of its work stated.

Mrs. Hooper then made an earnest plea for an enthusiasm in the support of an organization so beneficial to its members as well as to others, and asked each to give according to her wisdom, learning, and experience, in a spirit of good fellowship, and help to hasten the time when our pure and simple faith shall be better known, understood, and appreciated throughout the land.

Mrs. J. I. W. Thacher, the Secretary of the Conference, followed Mrs. Hooper with a report, in which she congratulated the Conference that, in the two years which have passed since it met in Saratoga in 1884, a better understanding of the objects of the Western Unitarian Conference had been brought about, and a more general interest in this work. Growth in numbers has been gradual, but steady. One hundred and fifty out of the three hundred and fifty Unitarian churches have connected themselves with the Conference, either by sending contributions or by forming branch societies. Of the eighty branches now in existence, twenty-five have been formed during the last two years; and there are also promises of others in the near future. These, for the most part, are in New England and New York; but there are branches in Atlanta and New Orleans, and a large one in which the five churches of Philadelphia, Vineland, and Wilmington are united, also one in Cincinnati. Our friends in San Francisco, though not bearing our name, are working with us.

Reports came from all these branches, which are encouraging, and which

Hosted by Google

show a desire among the women of our denomination to take part in this missionary work. There are four forms of work: first, collection of money by membership fees, or in other ways; second, correspondence with churches in need of sympathy or help; third, distribution of denominational literature; fourth, discussion of religious subjects and the formation of classes for the study of the principles of our faith. In the six years of its existence the Conference has added $20,000 to the funds of the American Unitarian Association, raised by membership fees, and sent out through the American Unitarian Association in many directions, helping to build churches, support missionaries, and to circulate Unitarian literature. It does not include money raised among the branches for special objects. Our desire is that each branch should enter into correspondence with churches, in the East or West, that need the cheering word and our moral support. Two years ago six or eight societies had become interested in the Post-office Mission. Enthusiasm in this part of the work has spread, and there are now twenty-five branches engaged in it. The whole country bids fair before long to be thoroughly canvassed by the advertisements of Unitarian publications to be sent free. This is especially helpful to those living in scattered homes, away from the centres of Unitarianism. Of great importance seems the sweet and beautiful relation which arises between those who are seeking and those who are giving counsel and enlightenment in the principles of our faith.

The memory of our beloved leader, Miss Ellis, of her ready sympathy, her enduring devotion and helpfulness, will be an ever-present inspiration to all who take part in this work. Every year fresh supplies of good books come forth, carrying instruction and entertainment to many humble homes, and find their way to those who "sit in darkness" in prison cells; and these lights are eagerly welcomed by them. In some of the branches carefully prepared programmes are arranged for the discussion of religious subjects, and at each meeting some paper or essay is presented and followed by discussion. In many cases some suggestive book is chosen for reading, which is followed by a valuable exchange of conversation.

In conclusion, churches and pastors are stronger for this union of earnest women who have pledged themselves to this missionary work and to these religious aids. Each new season of work brings new duties. Let us meet them with fresh courage and enthusiasm; and, with the stimulus which comes from this meeting, let us go back to our homes with a steadfast and more generous consecration of our time, our strength, and ourselves to the work which is intrusted to us.

The report of the Suffolk County Branch of the Women's Auxiliary Conference was then read by Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, of Boston, who said that nearly half the churches in the county had formed branches of the Auxiliary Conference, and, where there are no branches, many women belong to the general Conference.

The work of these various branches, varying in membership from thirty to two hundred and fifty, was enumerated. It consists in the sending of books and magazines to the various institutions of the country and to individuals all over the world, in the establishment of lending libraries of denominational books, and in the Post-office Mission. This latter has been an attractive branch of our work, and has convinced many doubting members of the utility and practical value of the Association. A high distinction has been won for the Post-office Mission work by the thorough and well-planned methods of its committee, and reference only to its annual reports is needed to show that all the most glowing anticipations of the advocates of the mission are fast becoming realized.

Hosted by Google

The assistance given to struggling societies, and also helping to organize and carry on new ones, is another part of the work of the Conference that has met with much success, both in the effort to raise the money for as well as in the achievement of the object.

The meetings of the Conference, the local as well as the union meetings, have been very interesting and instructive to all who have gathered at them, especially to the younger members, helping them to think for themselves, and enabling them to make distinct statements of what they as Unitarians believe.

In closing her report, Mrs. Fifield spoke of the sympathy given to the Women's Auxiliary Conference by our ministers, and expressed her gratitude for the large results which have been gained by earnest and well-disciplined co-operation.

A paper on "Our Missionary Work" was next read by Mrs. E. A. West, of Chicago. Mrs. West said that there are two things necessary for the successful prosecution of missionary work: first, a message of intrinsic worth; second, intelligent sincerity and zeal on the part of the messengers. Our Unitarian faith is a worthy message, since it grasps the lessons of the past with one hand, and reaches out with the other to the revelations of the future. It delivers us from the perplexities of the ancients and from the perplexities of modern theology.

Unitarianism has perfect trust in the reliableness of truth and recognizes that the lessons of the past have been stepping-stones to present attainment. Its glory is the combination of spiritual life and intellectual activity, adapting it to the needs of the people; and, considering the religious life a process of growth, it allows people to accept peaceably those views which they have the capacity to perceive and enjoy.

In our missionary work, religion is the attuning of the soul to harmonious feeling; and this harmony within will labor to produce harmony in social life by the removal of crime, selfishness, and suffering. In order to bring about a more intelligent sincerity and zeal on the part of the messengers of our faith, we must have more thorough understanding of the principles of Unitarianism, and a more thorough appreciation of its spirit. A knowledge of our own faith as compared with other faiths will remove a feeling of selfish indifference, which would make us refrain from helping others to gain what we as Unitarians enjoy in our liberal faith. Our zeal should be expended in developing a vigorous constructive system upon a basis of affirmations: thus shall we secure sympathetic and intelligent co-workers.

Another field for our missionary work is the home. Be yourself what you would have your child become is an excellent motto in home missionary work. The young can be enlisted into the field by showing them what they can do and giving them something to do.

Let us aim to establish an atmosphere of love and helpfulness in our religious work, and our religion will become a power to disseminate noble ideas, to manifest sincere love, and to perform helpful deeds.

Mrs. Mary E. Bagg, of Syracuse, followed with a paper on the "Responsibilities of Woman in the Church." No woman can be of use to her church, unless she comprehends what her church stands for. She must know, also, whether she rightfully belongs in its fold, what it teaches, what and why she believes; and her life must practically illustrate that belief.

To be helpful to her church, she must devote a part of her time, thought, and energies to its interests, not fitfully, but as a part of her regular duties.

Hosted by Google

Recognizing diversities of gifts, every woman should choose the sphere of usefulness for which she is best fitted. Let her who has the gift of consolation visit the sick and sorrowful. She who can speak to edification should be licensed to "deliver her burden." Let the reader read and the singer sing, the teacher teach and the artistic decorate. Let the dramatic entertain, the learned bring forward her facts, the experienced communicate her wisdom. Let the inventive plan and project, the practical devise ways and means, and the biddable execute. Let each accept her responsibility, discharge her duty, and be happy in the belief that the church cannot prosper without her help.

The essayist insisted upon the importance of training well and carefully the imagination of children. Children should also be taught to give of their own to charity and for church purposes and to lend a hand, though at sacrifice of pleasure or convenience. Mothers should insist upon their children of all ages accepting the religious and intellectual advantages offered by our pulpits, Sunday-schools, and Bible classes. Upon these last we must needs rely for a succession of devoted, intelligent teachers for the Sunday-school, upholders of the church and workers for the world.

Women may do much to improve and elevate the social life of the church,— throwing open their homes to church gatherings, thus giving variety and individuality to entertainments. They owe hospitality also to those who hold our faith in solitary places, and who are sorely in need of active sympathy cordially expressed.

And shame to us if we be not intelligent guides to the wanderers in the Valley of Decision, whose doubts have not yet put on the garb of faith, whose denials are not yet exchanged for affirmations, whose chaos has not yet become cosmos!

Among the dangers that threaten our Unitarian Church, none are more to be feared than ultra-conservatism, indifferentism, and the spirit of caste. Women are conservative by nature. New truths and beliefs are dreaded as disturbers; for they compel rearrangement of mental and theologic furniture, troublesome adaptation of old to new, and readjustments of relations to the worlds of matter, mind, and spirit. The middle-aged, the weak and tired, fall easy victims to ultra-conservatism. From this death in life let us pray to be delivered.

Not less to be dreaded is that indifferentism that excuses itself from denominational activities,— the false plea that it does not matter what one believes, provided the life be irreproachable; that is willing to leave all the work to the pastor or to a few faithful helpers. This is the spirit that finds excuses; that is easily prevented; that doesn't feel interested; that fails to realize that it takes all the pews as well as the pulpit to declare the whole gospel, to live it, disseminate it, evangelize the world.

The spirit of caste also is destructive of church life. It separates, divorces, dismembers, and leads on to dissolution. People say of others that they have "nothing in common." Nothing in common? Nothing at stake in humanity? Oh, sorrow and pity that heart sympathies are too weak to banish conventions, ceremonial laws, hindering etiquette!

Rev. Grindall Reynolds made a closing address, congratulating the organization upon the good work done.

The business meeting was held in the vestry of the Methodist church on Thursday afternoon at 3.30. There were present one hundred and fifteen members and delegates from branch societies. Mrs. Hooper presided. The minutes

Hosted by Google

of the previous meeting, together with the treasurer's report, were read and accepted. The resignation of Miss A. W. May, president, was accepted with regret. Reports were received from the various branch societies, and the following officers were elected: president, Mrs. J. W. Andrews, of Boston; vice-presidents, Mrs. S. T. Hooper and Mrs. Isabel C. Barrows, of Boston; Miss F. LeBaron, of Chicago; secretary, Mrs. George W. Thacher, of Boston; treasurer, Miss Flora L. Close, of Boston; directors, Maine Conference, Mrs. E. M. F. Bartlett, of Waterville, and Mrs. E. C. Jordan; New Hampshire, Miss Mary A. Downing, of Concord; Connecticut Valley, —— ——; Channing Conference, Mrs. Thomas R. Slicer, of Providence; Suffolk Conference, Mrs. Emily A. Fifield, of Dorchester; Norfolk Conference, Mrs. E. P. Channing, of Milton; Essex Conference, Mrs. Philip H. Wentworth, of Danvers; North Middlesex, Mrs. Anne B. Richardson, of Lowell; South Middlesex, Mrs. R. L. Hodgdon, of Arlington; Worcester Conference, not filled; Plymouth and Bay Conference, Miss Laura D. Russell, of Plymouth; Cape Cod Conference, Mrs. Catharine Starbuck, of Nantucket; New York State Conference, Mrs. George W. Cutter, of Buffalo; Middle States, Mrs. Fanny B. Ames, of Philadelphia; Ohio Valley, Mrs. Mary P. Smith, of Cincinnati, and Miss Mary H. Gale, of Cleveland; Wisconsin, Mrs. T. B. Forbush, of Milwaukee; Michigan, Mrs. J. T. Sunderland, of Ann Arbor; Illinois, Mrs. J. R. Effinger, of Chicago; Iowa, Mrs. Cordelia T. Cole, of Mount Pleasant; Indiana, Mrs. A. G. Jennings, of La Porte; Southern States, Mrs. George L. Chaney, of Atlanta, and Mrs. Charles A. Allen, of New Orleans; Pacific Coast Conference, Mrs. A. G. Soulé, San Francisco, Cal.

Post-office Mission Committee, Mrs. Henry L. Grew, Mrs. Cordelia T. Cole, Mrs. Fayette Smith, Miss F. LeBaron, Mrs. K. B. Paine, Mrs. E. G. May, Mrs. J. C. Kimball.

Hosted by Google

OUR OPPORTUNITY IN THE SOUTH.

BY REV. A. D. MAYO.

TWO YEARS ago, on this platform, I made report of my Ministry of Education in the Southern States, at the end of four years from its beginning. To-night, I can only say that for two years past the work has increased in its opportunities and demands far beyond my power to respond. Following the apostolic injunction, "Lay aside every weight," I have this year retired from educational journalism, and henceforth shall devote what remains of life and health to this great mission. I have now visited all the sixteen States once called the South, and believe I know "the lay of the land" concerning their educational status and needs.

In regard to the support of this ministry, I report that, while receipts from the South are gradually increasing, and entertainment and transportation are generally furnished, the latter by the courtesy of corporations *with* souls, I am yet compelled to rely on the kindness of the American Unitarian Association and Northern friends of education for two-thirds of my annual outfit. I wait, I hope, with exemplary patience, for the time when this moderate sum can be so assured by some permanent arrangement that the 1st of September shall not always force the question whether this work must stop or go on. After six years of a mission, not unknown certainly through all the Southland, is it too much to ask that a few of our large-hearted people will make some permanent arrangement to relieve me from this yearly burden of four months' vacation canvassing to obtain the means necessary to insure a campaign of eight months in "labors of love" among the children of the South?

The most interesting new development of the past two years has been the increasing liberality of many Southern churches and Sunday-schools, by invitations for Sunday services, lectures, and talks on the great theme. With the sole exception of the Catholic and Episcopal Churches, which cannot offer such courtesy, I have addressed large congregations, Christian and Hebrew, white and colored, always with the most cheerful acceptance. I am invited almost every Sunday to this preaching of the Gospel of Education, the most satisfactory phase of a ministry now prolonged forty years. No clergy have been more uniformly friendly than the Episcopal priesthood, and even one good Catholic father down in Louisiana invited me to attend mass and afterward address the people from the big gallery or porch of the church. I do not think I mistake in calling this an "opportunity" never enjoyed in similar degree by any clergyman of our faith.

I report the educational situation, through all these Southern States, as gradually improving,— about as fast as the financial improvement allows. The romance, so industriously worked during the past year by certain metropolitan journals, that the South is on the high road to educational sufficiency, doing about as well as rural New England, does not need national aid, would be "demoralized" by the same policy that has stimulated the West to the most splendid effort in history, is a romance. The plain facts of the situation are these: The

Hosted by Google

sixteen Southern States have now six million children and youth of the Southern school age,— six to twenty. All these, from the great difficulties of schooling young children in the South, need that common English education which is "the main chance" of the American boy and girl. Of these, not more than one-half look inside the school-house; and only one-third (two million) really enjoy four months' regular schooling a year,— nobody knows for how few years. This, with a large discount for poor teaching and the environment of an illiteracy which, in vast regions, includes one-half, sometimes three-fourths, the adult people, with a prodigious dearth of books and all the usual North American helps to popular intelligence, is the fact. But even this result has been achieved during the past fifteen years by such an effort as no people in Christendom, so situated, ever yet made. The Southern people tax themselves almost as heavily on their valuation of property as the Northern people for public schools, open to all. Indeed, many communities exceed this,— Arkansas leading Massachusetts, Charleston excelling Boston, Vicksburg ahead of New York. But, with all this sacrifice, under circumstances impossible to be realized, unless seen and lived among, the whole South this year will be able to spend for the education of six million less than twice as much as the State of Massachusetts invests in her three hundred thousand children and youth. I leave it to you to decide if this is "well enough" for sixteen American States, or if a people who have done this are complimented by being told they will be "demoralized" into cheats and shirks by the national bounty, on which the fourteen Western States have risen to imperial power and fame in the educational annals of the world.

So I am here to-night with my old story, that the one sovereign opportunity of every American Church, of American Christianity, of the upper side of the American people, is a mighty ministry of education to our Southern States. I do not ignore the just home claim of other States, cities, sections. But I observe that, while it is easy, popular, and pleasant to crowd our growing Northern cities and towns, even to repletion, with the means of universal education, it is every year becoming more difficult to keep our over-taxed and over-organized charitable Northern public awake to this fundamental necessity of work for the South. The only radical cure for all the peculiar evils that now vex the South is the great screw of universal education of the head, the heart, and the hand, through good schools, everywhere placed under the "mud-sills" of Southern society, and worked till the whole ground-floor is lifted into the light, the freedom, the glory, of a Christian civilization. Only as this is done will the Southern people come into the inheritance of the majestic forces reserved in that wonderful country for the honor of the Republic and the welfare of mankind. That achieved, the new South, with level eyes, confronts the mighty North,— perchance, in the long years to come, may take her turn in "saving the Union" from perilous tendencies that humble our pride and shake our souls in the midst of our boasted culture and wealth and power.

It is vain to wrangle, in or out of Congress, over tariff, currency, suffrage, civil service, the labor question, till this, the less-favored third of the Union, is brought into line by the elevation of her laboring millions to something of the intelligence, energy, and skill of their companions in the North. This left undone, earthquakes more terrible than have shaken Charleston, more devastating floods than drown Louisiana, epidemics more fatal than scourge Memphis, will crowd on the heels of that monster we call "Illiteracy," which, "being interpreted, meaneth" ignorance in the masses of an American State; tangled

Hosted by Google

up with superstition, shiftlessness, vulgarity, and vice; coming to the front in a public policy in great commonwealths that involves the whole country, and baffles the wit and wisdom of administrations, new or old. As well may you or I hold grave discourse on sanitary science, with one foot in a chair, twisted by gout or consumed by gangrene, as we, here in our Northern assemblies of churches, map out the millennium, religious or ethical, with half the Republic lying in such mental obscurity as I behold and live with eight months of every year. The one grand opportunity of every religious body is not to build up itself, not even to build up Christianity by building up itself, but to go forth into God's open mission field, and join, heart, head, and hand, with all the wise and good and efficient disciples of the gospel of love for the uplifting of mankind. The great mountain district of the South is a missionary field for our young clergy more inviting than any portion of the world. In the illimitable Gulf Region of the Republic is another mission field, wherein, within a generation, is to be decided the most profound and complex problem now before the American people,— the elevation to fit American citizenship of millions of freedmen of a race hitherto despised, of capacity still half unknown. If the consecration of the few remaining years of my life, by speech and pen, through prayer to God and entreaty, even to the verge of importunity, of women and men, shall help to arouse the broad-minded and deep-souled people of our Christian household, and send them forth into the glorious freedom of this boundless field, to do their uttermost for that higher American civilization which is only another name for the highest and best incarnation of a free, pure, and powerful Christian faith, I shall not have answered my call in vain.

Hosted by Google

THE ELEVATION OF THE NEGRO.

BY PROF. BOOKER T. WASHINGTON.

THE opportunities for help in the South are so many and varied that it is difficult to point out the direction in which most good can be done. But, on one point, however, I think all will agree. There is no lack of opportunities. All will agree, too, I think, that there is a kind of help that helps and a help that does not help. Our good Unitarian friends take it for granted that every one hailing from the South, clothed in a black skin, claiming Northern charity by virtue of his being a negro, is entitled to consideration. I think they help in a way that does not help. I claim that we are entitled to nothing, either good or bad, because we are black. We claim help simply because we are unfortunate, just as the Irishman or the Italian asks help because he is unfortunate.

The most striking need of the negro in the South will suggest the opportunities for help. The negro needs help in making the white people in the South know and respect him as a man. The people among whom he lives do not know and respect him as a man.

The same mistake is made in regard to the negro that is made in regard to other unfortunate races. It has been clearly demonstrated that those living nearest the Indian, with opportunities for knowing the most about him, really know the least about him. For years, the frontiersmen said that the Indian had only a wild side. They put him down as an untamable savage. The trouble is that the white people do not come in contact with the black man in the way of knowing him in the highest sense. The white people know the colored people as servants, cooks, waiters, or they are known as loafers and chicken thieves. An eminent Southern senator said in the United States Senate, some time ago, that, although in the last twenty years private and public aid had been lavished upon the negro, yet during that period he made no perceptible progress. If an investigation were made, it would be found that that man had never spent an hour in a colored school-house and had never entered the home of an educated negro. If a colored man gets into a fight, or steals a chicken, or does anything of that kind, it appears in the papers in glaring head-lines. If he buys a hundred acres of land or builds a home, or his son graduates from a school, it is not mentioned.

Against these comments of the senator, I put the remarks of Dr. Haygood, who knows more about the negro than any other man in this country. He says that the progress of the negro in the United States during the last twenty years is one of the marvels of history.

My point is this: that negroes will never be known and respected as men until their business side, as well as the mental and religious side, is developed. The best thing to do in regard to civil rights bills, and bills of like intent, in the South, is to let them alone, and throw our force to making a business man of the negro. I find that our Southern people are much like people elsewhere. Harmony between the two races will come in proportion as the black man gets something that the white man wants. Let there be in the community a negro farmer,

Hosted by Google

who, by virtue of his superior knowledge of the chemistry of the soil, can raise fifty bushels of grain while the white man raises only thirty, then the white man will come to the black man to learn. They will sit down together on the same seat, and talk about it. We must hasten the time when the negro will be master of the various trades and industries, and I am laboring for the time to come when a man in the North will have to debate the question whether his visitor comes as a solicitor of charity or to buy a thousand dollars worth of goods.

Our people need to be taught also that it is better to be a Christian than to be a Methodist or a Baptist, that it is better to save a soul than to subscribe to a creed.

At the Tuskegee Normal School, in Alabama, we have this year two hundred and sixty young men and women from all parts of the South. While we try to give special attention to mental and moral training, at the same time we lay the greater stress on industrial training; for we find that industrial training is, after all, the best moral training. In our carpenter shop, in our printing-office, on our farm, we try to give the students an opportunity to work part of their way through school,— to give them, in a broader sense, a business-like idea of how to make a living,— so they can go out on those large cotton plantations, where the majority of those people live, and help to lift them up. To get an idea of the poverty and ignorance of the negro, you must go miles into the country. It is to this class that we seek to send teachers, educated mechanics, and farmers. On those large cotton plantations, the schools are in session, on an average, but sixty-seven days in a year. As a rule, our race works. We often hear the opposite, but it usually comes from a white man lounging around under a tree and whittling sticks. [Laughter.] Like all flocks, we have a good many black sheep in ours. [Laughter.] The cursed mortgage and rent system in the South robs them of one-half of their earnings.

I have in my mind a young lady who graduated from our school over a year ago. She went into one of those communities, and began to work by drawing the people together. The result of that teacher's year's work is that those people have built and paid for a neat and comfortable school-house. Not until every community in the South gets a teacher like this can there be rest or cessation in this work. To my mind, the sending out of such workers as these to the South is the only solution of the negro problem. Few will deny that the opportunity for doing the most effective and wisest work is presented where the work can be done in co-operation with the system of public school authorities. We have a striking example of this in the effective work of Dr. Mayo in the Southern States.

In conclusion, I would add that the most encouraging feature in the Southern field lies in the fact that the Southern people themselves are beginning more and more to feel their responsibility in lifting the negro up. The State of Alabama gives every year $3,000 to aid the Tuskegee Normal School. In that school there are three students whose personal expenses have been met by Southern white men. The fact is that, directly after the war, the Southern white people thought that as soon as the negroes were educated they were going to become too proud to work. They see that the opposite of this is true; and then they are beginning to see — and the business success of individual colored men is teaching them — that, if we turn the colored people loose in the race of life, with an equal start with the other members of the human family, and the devil is told to catch the hindmost, he will not catch a negro every time. [Laughter and applause.]

Hosted by Google

I cannot conclude, ladies and gentlemen, without adding this word: there is an opportunity, by forethought and generosity, to save from overwork, worry, anxiety, and untimely death, and to save to the Southern work, such wise, whole-souled, and self-sacrificing men as Gen. S. C. Armstrong. We have an opportunity to do a work which will yield now and at this time one hundred-fold, and in the world to come eternal life.

Hosted by Google

OUR SOUTHERN AND INDIAN EDUCATIONAL WORK.

BY J. F. B. MARSHALL.

I AM glad of this unexpected opportunity to speak briefly before this Conference of the "Southern and Indian Educational Work" of the American Unitarian Association. This new branch of its activities was entered upon at New Year's, in charge of a committee who have intrusted its duties to me.

So far as its Southern work is concerned, the Association does not now propose the establishment of any new schools. Its aim is to make careful inquiry as to those already existing, and to recommend such only to the denomination for aid as are known to be broad, unsectarian, and efficient. For want of such a bureau of information, Unitarians are often deceived by unworthy claims; and much money is unwisely given which would have been a great help to deserving institutions.

Among the Southern schools most worthy of our confidence and support are Hampton Institute and its vigorous offspring, the Tuskegee Normal School of Alabama, which is wholly under the management of negro officers and teachers, most of whom are Hampton graduates. Its influence for good is already felt, not only in the State, but through all that section of the South.

The Channing School of Barnwell, S.C., established and maintained by a stanch Unitarian, Mrs. Mixson, has for many years been doing a good work, and is highly spoken of by the State Superintendent of Schools as doing a work that cannot be done by the public schools of that county. Mrs. Mixson has heretofore given up rooms in her own house for this school; but it has now outgrown these accommodations, and she asks aid to build a school-house, for which she will furnish the site. Surely, this appeal in behalf of the Channing School in Barnwell, S.C., ought to meet a cordial response from our denomination.

Our proposed *Indian* work is of a more definite character. Under the "peace policy," established by President Grant in 1874, which placed the various Indian tribes under the care of the leading religious bodies of the country, the Utes were assigned to the Unitarians. The agents selected by the American Unitarian Association were appointed by Government, and entered upon their duties. It was hoped that we should be able to establish schools among the Utes, the Government having pledged itself — among other considerations, for land given up by the tribe — to build school-houses for them. But frequent removals of the tribe to new reservations prevented the fulfilment of these pledges; and, as there was no assurance that the tribe would not be again removed as soon as buildings were completed, there was no encouragement for us to build them. And, with the virtual abandonment of the peace policy, our efforts for the Utes were suspended.

It was now thought, however, that work for the Utes could be resumed; and Mr. and Mrs. Henry F. Bond, who had formerly lived among them, and had become deeply interested in Indian education, accepted an appointment to return, and, if possible, establish an industrial school among them. If they found the obstacles still insuperable, they were instructed to proceed to the Crow Reservation in Montana, where we had been advised to establish our school by Capt. Henry Romeyn and Lieut. George Le Roy Brown, army officers, experienced in Indian

Hosted by Google

matters, both of whom had been successively detailed for military instructors at Hampton. Mr. Bond met no encouragement among the Utes, and at once visited the Crow reservation, where he found the needs great, and where, with the approval of the Association, he has located the school. The Crows are a peaceable tribe, having always been friendly to the whites. No missionary or educational work, except of a transient character, has ever been done among them. The tribe numbers about thirty-five hundred, of whom some eight hundred are children of school age. They are uncivilized and averse to changing their old modes of life, but are teachable, and honestly endeavoring to adapt themselves to the requirements of advancing civilization by taking up homesteads, building houses, and cultivating the soil. The small school, maintained by Government at the agency, which last year had an average of but twenty pupils, is the only one on this whole reservation.

The Government has granted us one hundred and sixty acres of land for the school; and a location has been selected by Mr. Bond on the banks of the Big Horn River, seven miles from Custer Station on the Northern Pacific Railroad, and on the mail route from the railroad to Fort Custer and the Crow agency. It has also agreed to contract for the payment of $108 per annum for each Indian pupil taught and supported at this school. This is to be an Industrial Boarding School, with a capacity of from thirty to fifty pupils. Mr. Bond's plans for the building, which is to be of logs, have been approved by the committee in charge of this work; and he has been instructed to push the work so that the building may be completed before the severe Montana winter sets in.

This, then, is our Indian educational work, begun in fulfilment of our pledges made in 1874, when, with other religious bodies, we accepted the trust committed to us by the Government. It has been undertaken in full faith that it will be heartily sustained by our denomination. For it, we ask your sympathy, your cordial co-operation, and your material aid. Will you not give them? Other denominations have for years been doing grand and effective educational and missionary work among the Indians. Faithful and earnest teachers, supported by them, have long been laboring with grand results. More than a quarter of a million dollars annually are expended by other denominations in this important work, while we have as yet accomplished nothing. We are called on, by every consideration of patriotism, philanthropy, and religion, to do our part. The opportunity is now offered. The work is begun, and only needs your cordial support to flourish and achieve grand results. For its maintenance, we need special contributions. We are without funds to go on with it, except as they have been *borrowed*, in the faith that you would sustain us. We need $5,000 to complete the building. We need funds to send out the teachers and employés that are wanted. An accomplished and zealous teacher, admirably equipped, is ready to go out, at much personal sacrifice, to engage in this missionary work. We need the funds necessary to send her. Will you not furnish them? In this great work of Indian education, our denomination alone has been idle, while others have labored, and are laboring, earnestly and successfully. It cannot be that this grand Unitarian denomination, with all its wealth, with all its philanthropy, will hold its hands when such an opportunity for the fulfilment of its pledges and for the accomplishment of a grand work for humanity is offered to it.

The work is well begun. Our faithful, earnest missionaries are on the ground, full of zeal for the great work they have undertaken. They look to you for encouragement and support. Will you not bid them God-speed, and cheer their hearts by the assurance of your cordial sympathy and material aid?

Hosted by Google

THE LIBERAL HOLLAND CHURCH OF GRAND RAPIDS.

BY REV. F. W. N. HUGENHOLTZ.

WITH great hesitation, yet with great pleasure, I accept the occasion to speak some words to you,— words of thanks for your hearty welcome and the kind manner in which some of you did what you could to make me feel at home. Yet there is another thing that makes your society homelike for me. It is that scarcely anybody spoke to me without speaking of my teacher and friend, Dr. Kuenen, with full admiration and sympathy.

How I would have liked to meet here with *him!* How glad would I be, could you know him as I do! Of course, you may admire the great scholar. We, his disciples and friends, love him, his humble, plain, unassuming character, his always humane behavior toward congenials and antagonists, his wide and noble heart. No convention or meeting of Holland modern theologians ever is held without, in the hours reserved for social entertainment, a fervent toast and a hearty draught in his honor, and a speech full of gratitude and reverence. If the American manner was known among us of three cheers and a tiger, too, his modesty would have to suffer many times from this unmelodious praise. [Laughter and applause.] Now, I am ashamed to state that this man, whom I have to thank for my welcome in your circle, known and read by nearly all liberal religious people in the United States, is unknown, or, if known, is despised and damned to hell by his own countrymen in America.

To explain this fact, we must go back forty years. At that time, the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church made some very liberal resolutions, on account of which many church members through the whole country left the old church, and formed a new, purely Calvinistic church, with devoted love and great readiness to offer their money. It must be acknowledged that these people had to suffer from a very illiberal treatment by the liberals of these days. And it was then that many of them sought the free soil of America, and builded here their new Dutch Reformed churches on a pure Calvinistic foundation.

These first Holland settlers invited, as soon as they found here bread and welfare, their friends and families to cross the ocean, and to join their colonies and churches. Hence, it comes that most all these Holland people are very orthodox. The few Hollanders who had a more liberal religious education could not stand alone; and, wishing to belong to some church, they joined, willingly or unwillingly, the existing churches.

But, nevertheless, they felt and made others feel religious needs which could not be satisfied by these churches. They could not endure in the long run that severe Calvinistic theology, which pressed as a heavy and frosty cloud upon their souls, and darkened there all light and gladness. In Grand Rapids, first, a small but resolute circle of liberal Hollanders came together; and, firmly convinced that they were not the only ones who thirsted for a gospel that might better merit this holy name, they began — it was in May, 1885 — to edify each other. At first,

Hosted by Google

they were only eight; but, week after week, their number increased, until they ventured to write to Dr. Kuenen, and to ask him if he would accept the guardianship of this new liberal Holland congregation, and send them a man of his choice. So I came here on the first day of December, 1885; and, since then, I have done what I could. At this moment, we have a congregation of nearly two hundred and fifty members, a Sunday-school of eighty children under the age of twelve years; while fifty older boys and girls, divided in four classes, attend my weekly lessons of religious instruction.

Our congregation aims — it is the first article of our constitution — "to promote the free development of religious life amid itself and beyond its borders." To realize this missionary character, we publish a monthly paper, which was happy enough to meet with heavy opposition, but is looking out for more subscribers; and, with the same missionary purpose, I visited in my vacation the city of Chicago, where, upon a call of some new friends, I lectured and preached for an interested Holland audience. Perhaps, in the future, another liberal Holland congregation will grow out of that movement. In the coming winter, I hope to visit Holland City in Michigan, and other Holland colonies; and so we hope that these American Hollanders will no longer contradict the old fame of their country, as the most liberal of all European nations, during all centuries the refuge of all who had to suffer for the sake of their religious belief or disbelief. [Applause.]

But, my friends, for all that we are doing and willing to do, we need a church, a home for ourselves; and, though we are building already, we do not know as yet how to finish it. My people did what they could, many of them more than that. They are most all working people, who have not much more than their daily bread. Without great help from outsiders, they paid the fare for me and my family and my library from Amsterdam to Grand Rapids. They paid our current expenses for this year, nearly $2,000; they paid for a lot for our church, $1,800,— all in this one year. But they cannot do more. Our building, with five or six hundred seats, will cost only $4,000. We got a mortgage of $3,000, but the last $1,000 gives us great trouble.

Now, I came here with the still — no, with the outspoken — hope that the great American Unitarian Society, many of whose members speak of their gratitude to Dr. Kuenen and Holland modern theology, would be willing to show their sympathy for the spiritual father, the guardian of our congregation, Dr. Kuenen, by material help to his American pupil.

Our needs forced us to get ready our building, if possible, before winter; but now my trustees are very anxious, lest those who pass it will say,— and many of them would say it with great satisfaction and joy,— "These men began to build, and they cannot end it."

Brethren, if you can do it, spare us that failure, which would be a failure for the whole liberal cause among Holland Americans. We had no earthquake; but it would be worse than that if our building should fall because there is no money to pay for the last nails. Mr. Gannett had the kindness to write an article upon our movement, and to request Unitarian help for our church. I mention with gratitude that we got, in answer to that request, $15. But we need $1,000, and we need it in two months.

But, my friends, whatever you may do or not do, my gratitude for your welcome will be the same; and, in answer to that welcome, I will assure you of my hearty wish to stand at your side, to join your brave army in promoting the free development of religious life in this New World.

Hosted by Google

DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MEMORIAL OF THE UNITARIAN EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

THE undersigned are a committee chosen by the Unitarian Educational Society of New Hampshire to memorialize the National Conference on the subject of denominational schools. The organization we represent, composed largely of the leading laymen of New Hampshire, was incorporated to carry into effect in that State the purpose which we now urge upon this Conference and the Unitarian denomination. Those whom we represent believe that this is one of the most important subjects that can now engage the thought and energies of the Unitarians of the United States. Acting upon this conviction, five years ago they established a school in their own State, Proctor Academy, at Andover, which is doing an admirable educational work, and which they regard as one of the strong forces of the denomination in New Hampshire.

Throughout this country there are schools of various grades and qualities,— boarding-schools for girls and for boys, and academies for the fitting of young men and women for college or directly for active life,— schools managed by religious sects, and one of whose chief purposes is to give the pupils a particular sectarian or theological bias. They are often efficient means of keeping young people in the doctrinal and ecclesiastical path of their parents and of bringing those of other parentage and antecedents into the same path.

In many parts of the country, a Unitarian parent or guardian has, at present, no alternative but to place his child or ward at the school of some other denomination, where, oftentimes, the sectarian purpose is paramount to the educational. So that, during this critical and formative period, the young person is not only banished from those religious influences which are deemed best for him by those who chiefly have his culture and welfare at heart, but is subjected to methods and motives which, from the Unitarian point of view, are positively objectionable; while many a student is taught that the religion of his parents is false and unsaving, and the persistent efforts employed for his conversion to the other creed are too apt to distract his mind and to produce a mental atmosphere which is fatal to a tranquil and filial pursuit of study.

It is noticeable in our parishes that, of the young people who are sent away to sectarian schools, very many make their religious choice under this almost violent pressure during their student life, and so, without deliberate thought or conviction, become lost to our churches.

We would not be understood as recommending a timid protection of young minds, on our part, against religious sects and sectarianism; but we do not think that it is right or wise to subject them entirely or chiefly to such influences during those years when they are most impressible and during which their characters and religious habits are being formed more effectively than at any other period of their lives. We believe that the religious instruction and culture of our children ought not to be put deliberately into the hands of teachers whose religious meth-

Hosted by Google

ods and spirit are largely alien and contradictory to our own. We believe that during these early years — as, indeed, always — the religious influences should have as much care and discretion as the intellectual.

We do not care at this time to multiply reasons; but we do most earnestly urge that the Unitarian body be actively alive to this matter, to the end that schools, whose religious influences they can approve, be built up where they are needed, and that those influences, in so far as possible, be brought about existing institutions of learning.

We move the passage of the following resolution: —

Resolved, That a committee of ten be appointed by the chair to take into consideration the subject of denominational schools, which committee shall report to the Conference at its next biennial meeting, and shall also be authorized to communicate its recommendations at any time to our religious body by such means as it may select.

(Signed) S. C. Beane.
John Bradley Gilman.
Herbert B. Dow.
Joseph W. Fellows.

Hosted by Google

THE UNITARIAN CHURCH TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

At the close of the general meeting, on Thursday afternoon, a meeting was called for the purpose of considering the formation of a National Union Temperance Society. Mr. W. H. Baldwin was called to the chair, and Rev. S. J. Barrows and Rev. C. R. Eliot were appointed secretaries. Mr. Eliot read a declaration of purpose for such a society. The following resolutions were offered by Rev. C. A. Staples: —

Resolved, That we hereby declare ourselves to be the Unitarian Church Temperance Society, and that we adopt the declaration of purpose and the general plan suggested by Mr. Eliot; also, that a committee of five be appointed to arrange details, and to solicit the formation of branch temperance societies.

Adopted.

Rev. C. R. Eliot, Rev. W. I. Nichols, Rev. Mr. Marsh, Rev. J. H. Crooker, and Rev. H. H. Barber were appointed a committee of five to act as stated in the resolution. To this committee was added Rev. C. A. Staples. The meeting adjourned at 6 P.M., until the close of the evening meeting.

At 9.30 P.M., Thursday evening, a meeting of the society was held to hear the report of the committee.

The following constitution was reported and adopted: —

CONSTITUTION.

I. The name of this organization shall be "The Unitarian Church Temperance Society."

II. The purpose of this society shall be to work for the cause of temperance in whatever ways may seem to it wise and right; to study the social problems of poverty, crime, and disease in their relation to the use of intoxicating drinks, and to diffuse whatever knowledge may be gained; to discuss methods of temperance reform; to devise and, so far as possible, to execute plans for practical reform; to exert, by its meetings and by its membership, such influence for good as by the grace of God it may possess.

III. This society shall be composed of such branch societies as may be formed, in sympathy with the above-named purpose, either in churches or Sunday-schools.

IV. The regular meeting of this society shall be held once in two years, in connection with the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches; and each branch society shall be represented at such meetings by two delegates. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Board.

V. The officers of this society shall be a president, vice-president, secretary, who shall also be treasurer, and nine directors, who, together with the other officers, shall constitute the Executive Board.

In addition to the usual duties of such officers, the Executive Board shall prepare and recommend plans for the organization and work of the branch societies.

Hosted by Google

VI. The office of the Central Society shall be simply advisory to the branch societies, and no vote passed shall be binding upon or in any way interfere with the work of these branch societies.

VII. This constitution may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates present at any regular meeting, provided notice of the proposed amendment be sent to all the branch societies two months previous to such meeting.

The following officers were elected: —

President, Rev. Christopher R. Eliot; Vice-President, William H. Baldwin; Secretary and Treasurer, Rev. J. L. Marsh, of Winchester, Mass; Directors: Rev. C. F. Dole, of Jamaica Plain; Mrs. W. S. Crosby, of South Boston; Miss Mary J. May, of Dorchester, Mass.; Rev. A. G. Jennings, State missionary for the State of Indiana; Rev. Lyman Clark, of Ayer, Mass.; George M. Rose, of Toronto; Mrs. Paul R. Wright, of Santa Barbara, Cal.; Mrs. Charles G. Ames, of Philadelphia; Rev. J. Ll. Jones, of Chicago.

Hosted by Google

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

CONSTITUTION.

PREAMBLE. *Whereas* the great opportunities and demands for Christian labor and consecration, at this time, increase our sense of the obligations of all disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ to prove their faith by self-denial, and by the devotion of their lives and possessions to the service of God, and the building up of the kingdom of his Son,—

ARTICLE I. Therefore the Christian churches of the Unitarian faith, here assembled, unite themselves in a common body, to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches, to the end of energizing and stimulating the denomination with which they are connected to the largest exertions in the cause of Christian faith and work.

ART. II. This National Conference shall be composed of such delegates, elected once in two years, not to exceed three from any church, including its minister, who shall officially be one, as any of our churches may accredit to it by a certificate of their appointment.

ART. III. The American Unitarian Association, the Western Conference, and such other theological, academic, or humane organizations in our body as the Conference may see fit to invite, shall be entitled to representation by not more than three delegates each.

ART. IV. The Conference shall meet biennially, at such time and place as it may designate at its successive biennial sessions.

ART. V. Its officers shall consist of a President, six Vice-Presidents, a General Secretary, a Treasurer, and a Council of ten,— half ministers and half laymen,— who shall be elected at each meeting, to hold their offices for two years, and until their successors are appointed. And half the number of the Council shall consist of new members, the oldest members being retired at each election and giving place to the new members.

ART. VI. The Council, during the intervals of the biennial sessions, may fill vacancies in the board of government, and shall have charge of all business having reference to the interests of the Conference, and intrusted to it by that body, which is hereby declared a purely advisory one.

ART. VII. The National Conference, until further advised by its experience, adopts the existing organizations of the Unitarian body as the instruments of its power, and confines itself to recommending them to such undertakings and methods as it judges to be in the heart of the Unitarian denomination.

ART. VIII. This Constitution may be amended, at any regular meeting of the Conference, by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the delegates accredited thereto.

ART. IX. Reaffirming our allegiance to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and desiring to secure the largest unity of the spirit and the widest practical co-operation, we invite to our fellowship all who wish to be followers of Christ.

Hosted by Google

ART. X. While we believe that the Preamble and Articles of our Constitution fairly represent the opinions of the majority of our churches, yet we wish distinctly to put on record our declaration that they are no authoritative test of Unitarianism, and are not intended to exclude from our fellowship any who, while differing from us in belief, are in general sympathy with our purposes and practical aims.

BY-LAWS.

1. Three months, at least, before the time fixed by the National Conference for its biennial meeting, the Council shall issue a circular letter of call to the churches and organizations in its fellowship, accompanying it with a form of certificate, the production of which shall be the proof of membership of the Conference until others are elected, unless otherwise ordered by the Conference.

2. The General Secretary shall keep a full report of the proceedings of the body, which shall be published at the expense of the Conference, and a copy sent to every delegate.

3. The Council, at the conclusion of each Conference, shall issue an address to the churches and organizations in our body, whether members of this Conference or not, to be published with the proceedings of the Conference, containing such advice and encouragement as it may deem appropriate; but especially communicating to the churches and organizations the recommendations of the Conference in regard to plans and methods of work, the amount of money required for the uses of the year, the special objects to which they would advise its appropriation, with such suggestions, as to a just apportionment of the burden, as they may judge expedient and becoming.

4. The Council shall have for its duty to keep itself accurately informed of the plans and operations of the various organizations in our body, and of the state of the individual churches; inviting correspondence and soliciting reports, to be sent in one month before the biennial meeting, in which the general condition of the parish, its Sunday-school, charities, and general working may be set forth, to the end that the Conference may know what the wants and the wishes of the churches are somewhat more particularly than it is possible to learn in the necessary hurry of the biennial meeting.

5. The General Secretary of the National Conference shall be the person to whom all letters and communications shall be addressed; and he shall be, *ex officio*, a member of the Council and constitute its Secretary.

6. The list of delegates, churches, and organizations represented in each Conference shall be part of the Biennial Report. The archives of the Conference shall be in the keeping of the General Secretary, subject to inspection and temporary possession by the Council.

7. A collection shall be taken up among the delegates at each Conference, to which any others may contribute, to defray the incidental expenses of the Conference,— such as printing the Report, etc.

8. Each church in this Conference is recommended to defray the expenses of its delegates.

Hosted by Google

LIST OF DELEGATES

REPORTED AS APPOINTED TO THE TWELFTH SESSION OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF UNITARIAN AND OTHER CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, HELD AT SARATOGA, N.Y., SEPT. 20–24, 1886.

FOREIGN DELEGATES.

The British and Foreign Unitarian Association: Rev. G. Vance Smith, D.D., Ph.D., of Carmarthen, Wales; Rev. Stopford Wentworth Brooke, M.A., of London; Mr. J. W. Rayner Wood, of Manchester; Rev. J. P. Bland, of Sheffield.

MAINE.

Augusta — UNITARIAN CHURCH AND SOCIETY: Rev. P. S. Thacher, Luther Stephenson, Jr., Miss Annie Hatch.

Bangor — INDEPENDENT CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. George C. Cressey, Mrs. John A. Peters, Mrs. Harriet S. Griswold.

Brunswick — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Mr. and Mrs. William Gore.

Dixfield — FIRST CHURCH: Hiram M. Cox, Mary S. Greenleaf.

Eastport — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. H. D. Catlin, Miss Annie Noyes, Mrs. L. M. Whalen.

Houlton — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. D. K. Crosby, Mr. and Mrs. Hudson T. Frisbie.

Kennebunk — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL PARISH: Rev. Charles C. Vinal, Walter L. Dane, Sidney T. Fuller.

Portland — FIRST PARISH: Rev. Thomas Hill, D.D., Mark P. Emery, M. B. Stevens.
PREBLE CHAPEL: Rev. W. T. Phelan, Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Farrington.

Saco — SECOND PARISH: Rev. J. T. G. Nichols, Mrs. Nichols.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Andover — CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Thomas Thompson.

Charlestown — SOUTH PARISH: Rev. C. D. Howard, Mrs. David A. Gage, Mrs. C. D. Howard.

Concord — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. John B. Gilman, Solon A. Carter, Miss M. A. Downing.

Dover — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. E. P. Sheafe, Jeremiah Smith, Henry A. Worthen.

Exeter — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. A. C. Dickerson, Charles N. Healey, Mrs. C. D. Cowle.

Fitzwilliam — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. George H. Hosmer, Mrs. E. E. Carter, Mrs. S. A. Haskell.

Francestown — UNION CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Joseph Wassall.

Keene — CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. George W. Gallagher, E. C. Thayer, C. F. Rowell.

Laconia — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. N. Pardee, Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Melcher.

Littleton — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. Jas. B. Morrison, George T. Cruft, George K. Stocker.

Manchester — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Mrs. Sarah T. Hersey, Mrs. Dana D. Town, Mrs. Sarah M. Tubbs.

Peterboro — CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. W. H. Walbridge, E. W. McIntosh, Mrs. John Wilder.

Portsmouth — SOUTH PARISH: Rev. Alfred Gooding, George T. Vaughn, Mrs. F. W. Miller.

Walpole — WALPOLE TOWN CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. John Williams, Mrs. Charles Hooper.

Wilton — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. F. L. Phalen, Mr. and Mrs. George M. Batchelder.

Wilton (East) — LIBERAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH: Rev. F. L. Phalen, Mr. and Mrs. E. G. Woodman.

Wolfboro — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. S. C. Beane, Joseph Lewando, William B. Hodge.

VERMONT.

Brattleboro — UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. S. M. Crothers, Dorman B. Eaton, Mrs. Warden.

Burlington — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. L. G. Ware, Mr. Fred. Johonnott, Mr. A. E. Richardson.

Montpelier — CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH: Rev. J. Edward Wright, Mrs. H. S. Loomis, Mrs. A. O. Cummins.

Stowe — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Perry Marshall, Mrs. Phebe Mower, Miss Ida Harris.

Windsor — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Nathan S. Hill, Mr. and Mrs. Albert P. Weston.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Andover (North) — NORTH PARISH CHURCH AND SOCIETY: Rev. Charles Noyes, Samuel D. Stevens, George Abbot.

Hosted by Google

Arlington — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL PARISH: Rev. John P. Forbes, Mrs. Charles F. King, Mrs. William T. Foster.

Ashby — FIRST PARISH: Rev. George S. Shaw, Mr. and Mrs. Joel Foster.

Athol — SECOND UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Charles P. Lombard, Mr. and Mrs. Alpheus Harding.

Ayer — FIRST UNITARIAN PARISH: Rev. Lyman Clark, Henry A. Brown, Sarah J. Brown.

Barre — FIRST PARISH: Rev. A. F. Bailey, Dr. J. O. Cook, Matthew Walker.

Bedford — FIRST PARISH: Rev. George F. Piper, Mr. and Mrs. Albert T. Bacon.

Belmont — Mr. and Mrs. J. V. Fletcher, Mrs. M. F. W. Homer.

Berlin — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Mr. and Mrs. Willard C. Carter.

Bernardston — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. William L. Jenkins, John Sanderson, S. B. Slate.

Beverly — THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. E. C. Butler, Samuel B. Symonds, James Marsters.

Billerica — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Miss Abbie Jaquith, Mrs. Dudley Foster.

Bolton — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Mr. and Mrs. R. Barrett, Mrs. Achsah Sawyer.

Boston — FIRST CHURCH: Rev. J. H. Morison, D.D., Hon. A. L. Soule.

SECOND CHURCH: William W. Warren, John G. Wetherell, Albert Tolman.

BULFINCH PLACE CHAPEL: Rev. S. H. Winkley, Miss Grace E. Atkins, Mrs. Frances M. Hubbard.

CHURCH OF THE DISCIPLES: Rev. J. F. Clarke, D.D., Darwin E. Ware, Mrs. J. G. Nickerson.

SOUTH CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. E. E. Hale, D.D., A. Z. Smith, Mrs. J. A. Andrews.

CHURCH IN ARLINGTON STREET: Rev. Brooke Herford, Elisha Atkins, J. B. Case.

CHURCH OF THE UNITY: Rev. Minot J. Savage, Henry F. Miller, Frank B. Thayer.

HOLLIS STREET CHURCH: Rev. H. B. Carpenter, Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Waters.

NEW SOUTH CHURCH: Rev. George H. Young, Henry C. Whitcomb, Miss E. S. Emmons.

WARREN STREET CHAPEL: Rev. Eber R. Butler, Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Weltch.

(Brighton) — FIRST PARISH: Rev. William P. Tilden, Isaac S. West, J. P. C. Winship.

(Charlestown) — HARVARD CHURCH: Rev. Pitt Dillingham, William Murray, Mrs. A. G. Wyman.

(Dorchester) — FIRST PARISH: Rev. Christopher R. Eliot, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Allen.

(Dorchester) — HARRISON SQUARE CHURCH: Rev. C. D. Bradlee, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Carr.

(Dorchester) — THIRD RELIGIOUS SOCIETY: Rev. William L. Lawrance, Mr. and Mrs. N. B. Stevens.

(East Boston) — CHURCH OF OUR FATHER: Rev. George M. Bodge, Edward Brigham, Rufus Cushman.

(Jamaica Plain) — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Charles F. Dole, William E. James, Mrs. Thomas B. Frothingham.

(Neponset) — CHURCH OF THE UNITY: George F. Pierce, Laban Pratt.

(Roxbury) — FIRST RELIGIOUS SOCIETY: Rev. James De Normandie, Mrs. Eliza S. Nevins, J. Felt Osgood.

(Roxbury) — MT. PLEASANT CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. William H. Lyon, Theodore H. Bell, Mrs. J. H. Meredith.

(West Roxbury) — FIRST PARISH: Rev. A. M. Haskell, Mrs. Haskell, Mrs. Buckminster.

(South Boston) — HAWES PLACE CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Charles B. Elder, Mrs. W. S. Crosby, Miss Irene G. Hersey.

(South Boston) — UNITY CHAPEL: Rev. William H. Savary, Mrs. Emily L. Geer, Miss S. Annie Hardy.

Brewster — FIRST UNITARIAN PARISH: Rev. Thomas Dawes, Annette T. Cobb, Olive C. Winslow.

Bridgewater: Rev. Thomas W. Brown, Mitchell Hooper, Hosea Kingman, Esq.

Bridgewater (East) — FIRST PARISH: Rev. J. W. Quinby, Mr. and Mrs. Elial Latham.

Bridgewater (West) — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. William Brown, Mrs. Anna S. LeLacheur, Mrs. Salome S. Brown.

Brockton — UNITY CHURCH: Mr. and Mrs. Ellis Packard.

Brookfield — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. Samuel Hamlet, Miss Eliz. Hobbs, Mrs. Hiram P. Gerald.

Brookline — FIRST PARISH: Rev. H. N. Brown, Dana Estes, Thomas H. Talbot.

Cambridge — FIRST PARISH: Rev. E. H. Hall, Arthur E. Jones, Miss Clara Howe.

THIRD CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. George W. Briggs, D.D., John Ruggles, Mrs. Martha B. Wellington.

Canton — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL PARISH: Rev. H. F. Jenks, Charles H. French Jr., Miss C. T. Downs.

Carlisle — FIRST RELIGIOUS SOCIETY: Rev. George F. Piper, Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Wilson.

Chelmsford — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. A. Chase, Mr. and Mrs. David A. Russell.

Chicopee — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Edward F. Hayward, Mrs. Amelia W. Hunter, Mrs. J. F. Nealley.

Clinton — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. C. Duncan, Mrs. E. A. Harris, Miss H. N. Kendall.

Cohasset — FIRST PARISH: Rev. Joseph Osgood.

Hosted by Google

Concord — FIRST PARISH: Rev. B. R. ulkeley, Harvey Wheeler, Henry J. losmer.

Danvers — UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL OCIETY: Miss Abby H. Putnam, Miss Mary V. Nichols, Miss Sarah E. Wentworth.

Dedham — FIRST PARISH: Rev. S. C. each, Mr. H. G. Guild, Mrs. E. A. French.

Deerfield — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL HURCH: Rev. Edgar Buckingham, F. W. ratt.

Dighton — THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Irs. M. J. Talbot, Mrs. N. T. Baxter, Mrs. . T. Shove.

Easton (North) — UNITY CHURCH: Rev. William L. Chaffin, Mr. and Mrs. Oakes A. mes.

Fall River — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. . Judson Rich, Mr. and Mrs. Dr. Hooper.

Fitchburg — FIRST PARISH: Rev. W. H. ierson, John F. Bruce, Mrs. W. H. Pierson.

Framingham — FIRST PARISH: Rev. C. A. lumphreys, Hon. A. S. Lewis, W. H. Mellen.

Gardner — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: ev. W. C. Litchfield, Mr. W. E. Mason, Mr. . V. Reynolds.

Gloucester — FIRST PARISH: Rev. John . Green, Miss Hannah Center, Miss Louise avis.

Grafton — CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: ev. E. Q. S. Osgood, Horace S. Warren, Vinthrop Faulkner.

Greenfield — THIRD CONGREGATIONAL OCIETY: Rev. Arthur A. Brooks, Franklin . Allen, Miss Mary Wiley.

Groton — FIRST PARISH: Rev. Joshua oung, Daniel Needham, Mrs. B. Ward Dix.

Harvard — THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY: ev. W. H. Reeby, Mr. and Mrs. G. T. ale.

Haverhill — FIRST PARISH: Rev. J. E. t. John, John A. Appleton, Mrs. Ellen M. ppleton.

Hingham — THIRD CONGREGATIONAL OCIETY: Rev. A. T. Bowser, Mr. and Mrs. . W. Rogers.

FIRST PARISH: Rev. H. Price Collier, William Fearing, 2d, Mrs. E. L. Ripley.

Holyoke — LIBERAL CHRISTIAN CONGREATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Granville Pierce, lemens Herschel, Rufus Mosher.

Hopedale — THE HOPEDALE PARISH: ev. Lewis G. Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Henry . Patrick.

Hubbardston — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL OCIETY: Rev. George F. Clark, Mrs. L. A. ratt, Mrs. Abby L. Warren.

Hudson — UNION SOCIETY: Rev. Clarce Fowler, Mr. and Mrs. Charles A. Wood.

Hyde Park — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. James Huxtable, Mr. and Mrs. ndrew Washburn.

Kingston — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL ARISH: Rev. C. Y. De Normandie, Mrs. rank H. Holmes, Walter H. Faunce.

Leicester — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL OCIETY: Rev. R. F. Johonnot, Rev. Samuel ay, Mrs. Ellen L. Woodcock.

Leominster — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. William H. Savage, Miss Fannie L. Howe, Mrs. Mary Todd.

Lexington — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. C. A. Staples, E. A. Mulliken, George O. Davis.

Lexington (East): FOLLEN CHURCH: Rev. W. H. Branigan, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin S. Spaulding.

Littleton — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. W. I. Nichols, J. H. Kimball, Miss S. F. White.

Lowell — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. L. Seward, Hon. D. S. Richardson, Mrs. Anne B. Richardson.

Lynn — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. S. B. Stewart, Mrs. George W. Keene.

Malden — FIRST UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. B. H. Bailey, Mrs. George J. Greenleaf, Mrs. S. C. Jones.

Marlboro — WEST PARISH: Rev. R. A. Griffin, F. A. Howe, Ambrose M. Page.

Medfield — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL PARISH: Dr. J. H. Richardson, Elizabeth C. Sewall.

Medford — FIRST PARISH: Rev. H. C. De Long, Miss Haven.

Melrose — UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. J. H. Heywood, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Mrs. Joseph Dearborn.

Mendon — FIRST PARISH: Rev. James Sallaway, Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Taft.

Millbury — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Julius Blass, Silas Dunton, John Rhodes.

Milton — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. Roderick Stebbins, A. L. Hollingsworth, Miss Harriet Ware.

Montague — TURNER'S FALLS SOCIETY: Mrs. W. H. P. Gilmore.

Nantucket — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. C. A. Roys, Mrs. Frederick C. Sanford, Miss Susan Starbuck.

Needham — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY — Rev. S. W. Bush, Mrs. J. F. Bush, Miss Laura Pollock.

Newburyport — FIRST RELIGIOUS SOCIETY: Rev. D. W. Morehouse, Rev. William O. Moseley, Albert W. Greenleaf.

Newton — CHANNING RELIGIOUS SOCIETY: Rev. F. B. Hornbrooke, Judge Robert C. Pitman, Mrs. H. W. Drew.

Newton Centre — THE UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Horace L. Wheeler, Charles H. Polsey, Miss Anna C. Ellis.

Newton (West) — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Julian C. Jaynes, Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Burrage.

Northampton — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Charles E. St. John, Mrs. F. A. Stockwell, Mrs. C. C. Tracy.

Northboro — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. Obed Eldridge, Miss Elizabeth A. Allen, Cyrus Gale.

North Easton — UNITY CHURCH: Rev. W. L. Chaffin, Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Gilmore.

Northfield — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: A. C. Parsons, Mr. and Mrs. Charles Alexander.

Peabody — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH:

Hosted by Google

Rev. J. W. Hudson, Mrs. Philip T. Nelson, Nathaniel Symonds.

Pembroke — FIRST PARISH: Rev. H. D. Dix, Mrs. H. D. Dix, Miss F. M. Collamore.

Pepperell — FIRST PARISH: Mr. and Mrs. George G. Tarbell, Henry Blake.

Petersham — FIRST PARISH: Rev. I. F. Porter, Mrs. Thomas Howe, Miss L. G. Wetherell.

Quincy — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. D. M. Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. William F. Whitney.

Reading — CHRISTIAN UNION CHURCH: Rev. Charles J. Staples, Mr. and Mrs. Carroll D. Wright.

Revere — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Cary F. Abbott, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Spavin.

CHURCH OF THE UNITY: Rev. J. W. Winkley.

Rockland — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. H. C. McDougall, Charles S. Millett, Ada Wheeler.

Rowe — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. J. M. W. Pratt, Mr. and Mrs. B. T. Henry.

Salem — INDEPENDENT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH in Barton Square: Rev. B. F. McDaniel, Wm. R. Colby, Mrs. N. A. Horton.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Fielder Israel, William H. Simonds, Jr., Miss Caroline Rea.

NORTH SOCIETY: Rev. E. B. Willson, Stephen G. Wheatland, Mrs. James B. Nichols.

SECOND CHURCH: Rev. W. H. Ramsay.

Sandwich — FIRST CHURCH: Miss Ann C. Nye.

Scituate — FIRST PARISH: George O. Allen.

Sharon — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Lathrop, H. S. Shepard.

Sherborn — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. Eugene De Normandie, James H. Leland, Daniel L. Whitney.

Shirley — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. L. B. Macdonald, Mr. and Mrs. Jacob P. Hazen.

Somerville — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. J. S. Thomson, Mr. and Mrs. Henry F. Spencer.

Springfield — THIRD CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. John Cuckson, Homer Foot, W. S. Smith.

Sterling — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. J. H. Whitmore, Eli Kilburn, Mrs. Clara A. Freeman.

Stow — FIRST PARISH: Rev. J. S. Moulton, Mrs. A. B. Taylor, Mrs. U. M. Lewis.

Taunton — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Thompson Newberry, Henry C. Perry, Eben D. Tisdale.

Templeton — FIRST PARISH: Mr. and Mrs. Charles S. Lord, Miss Maria Cutting.

Turner's Falls — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. C. Parsons, Mrs. W. H. P. Gilmore, Mrs. E. C. Coy.

Tyngsboro — FIRST PARISH: Rev. James Danforth, Ebenezer Swan, Mrs. Jennie Andrews.

Upton — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY Rev. George T. Ball, Emma F. Aldrich A. S. Davis.

Vineyard Haven — UNITARIAN MISSION Gilbert H. Smith, Mary H. Smith.

Walpole — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Mrs. Anna M. Leach, Maria E. Pickering

Waltham — FIRST PARISH: Rev. Edward J. Young, Arthur T. Lyman, Thomas P Smith.

Ware — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev B. G. Stevenson, Hon. Charles A. Stevens Miss Julia M. Stevens.

Warwick — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL PARISH — Rev. H. Tambs Lyche, Mrs. Dean, Mrs M. A. Green

Watertown — FIRST PARISH: Jonathan Bigelow, Mr. and Mrs. Solon F. Whitney.

Waverley — CHRISTIAN UNION SOCIETY Mrs. B. F. Chandler, Mrs. S. A. Rice.

Wellesley Hills — UNITARIAN SOCIETY Rev. A. B. Vorse, Mrs. Vorse, Miss Laura Dillaway.

Westboro — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. E. C. Abbott, Mrs. Wm. Blake.

Westford — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL PARISH: Rev. W. R. G. Mellen.

Weston — FIRST PARISH: Rev. C. F. Russell, Gen. J. F. B. Marshall, Miss E. Gowing

West Townsend — LIBERAL CHRISTIAN SOCIETY: Mr. and Mrs. Morton Barrett.

Whitman — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY Rev. Solon A. Whitcomb, Julius C. Gilbert Mrs. Charles C. Nash.

Winchester — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev J. Lewis Marsh, Mrs. D. N. Skillings, Mrs S. H. Folsom.

Woburn — FIRST UNITARIAN PARISH Rev. H. A. Westall, Joseph W. Hammond Mrs. Austin Wyman.

Worcester — SECOND PARISH: Rev. Austin S. Garver, Hon. Phineas Ball, Miss F. A Hill.

CHURCH OF THE UNITY: Rev. Calvin Stebbins, C. G. Wood, Stephen Holman

RHODE ISLAND.

Newport — CHANNING MEMORIAL CHURCH: Rev. John W. Day, John G Weaver, Dr. A. F. Squire.

Providence — OLNEY STREET CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Alfred Manchester, Mrs. Sarah A. Manchester, Mrs. Clara J Holbrook.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, William B Weeden, Miss Caroline Richmond.

WESTMINSTER SOCIETY: Henry A Howland, Samuel A. Nightingale.

CONNECTICUT.

Brooklyn — FIRST ECCLESIASTICAL SOCIETY: Rev. A. J. Culp, Charles G. Williams Mrs. Delia Walker.

Hartford — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY Rev. J. C. Kimball, Horace Cornwall, Miss Edith Spencer.

Hosted by Google

NEW YORK.

Brooklyn — FIRST UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Isaac H. Cary, William H. Cromwell, Mrs. I. H. Cary.

SECOND UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. John W. Chadwick, Theodore T. Ovington, Monroe B. Bryant.

THIRD SOCIETY: Rev. S. H. Camp, Miss M. E. Woods.

WILLOW PLACE CHAPEL: Rev. A. D. Smith.

Buffalo — CHURCH OF OUR FATHER: Rev. George W. Cutter, E. H. Howard, J. C. Forbush.

New York — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN CHURCH: W. H. Badger, Dr. G. Q. Colton, Mrs. J. H. Parker.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. Theodore C. Williams, James M. Drake, Dorman B. Eaton.

UNITY CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Wilson.

Rochester — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. N. M. Mann, Dr. L. Crittenden.

Syracuse — UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. S. R. Calthrop, C. D. B. Mills, Mrs. J. L. Bagg.

Trenton: REFORMED CHRISTIAN CHURCH: Rev. William Silsbee, Wm. Powell, Mrs. A. E. Powell.

Troy — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. William H. Spencer, Henry D. Lamb, Thomas Coleman.

Yonkers — FIRST UNITARIAN CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Duncan Smith, Mrs. Joseph Mattison, Miss Joanna Williams.

NEW JERSEY.

Camden — UNITY CHURCH: Rev. N. A. Haskell, Thomas B. Harned, Wilson Ernst.

Vineland — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. N. A. Haskell, George Barden, Helen S. Gage.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Germantown — UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. John H. Clifford, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas P. Galvin.

Meadville — INDEPENDENT CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH: Rev. H. H. Barber, Clinton Cullum, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore.

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICALL SCHOOL: Miss Elizabeth G. Huidekoper, Rev. A. A. Livermore, Prof. George L. Cary.

Philadelphia — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. Joseph May, Charles E. Haven, E. Coleman.

SPRING GARDEN UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Hector McIntosh, Mrs. Anna W. Longstreth, Paschal H. Coggins.

Union City — UNITY SOCIETY: Rev. L. W. Mason, Mrs. E. W. Warden, Mrs. D. W. Camp.

DELAWARE.

Wilmington — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Dr. Henry R. Wilson, George W. Stone, Thomas McClary.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Washington — ALL SOULS' CHURCH: Rev. Rush R. Shippen, S. R. Bond, J. E. Mason.

MARYLAND.

Baltimore — FIRST INDEPENDENT CHURCH: Rev. Charles R. Weld, Enoch Pratt, Thomas J. Morris.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Charleston — UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. E. C. L. Browne, Miss Annie V. Jones.

LOUISIANA.

New Orleans — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. Charles A. Allen, John M. Gould, Edward Heath.

GEORGIA.

Atlanta — CHURCH OF OUR FATHER: Rev. George L. Chaney, Miss E. E. Coolidge, Mrs. W. C. Morrill.

OHIO.

Cincinnati — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. George A. Thayer, Mrs. Jeremy Peters.

Cleveland — CHURCH OF THE UNITY: Rev. F. L. Hosmer, Joseph W. Willard, Miss Elizabeth F. White.

Marietta — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. James T. Lusk, Mrs. J. T. Lusk, James Holden.

ILLINOIS.

Alton — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. Judson Fisher, Mrs. L. B. Fisher.

Chicago — UNITY CHURCH: Rev. T. G. Milsted, Calvin R. Corbin, Frances J. Howe.

CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH: Rev. David N. Utter.

THIRD UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. J. Vila Blake.

ALL SOULS' CHURCH: Rev. J. Ll. Jones, Mrs. E. T. Leonard, Mrs. E. E. Marean.

Geneseo — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. M. J. Miller, Mrs. M. J. Miller.

Quincy — SECOND CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY: Rev. John Tunis, Mrs. A. C. McFadon.

IOWA.

Algona — UNITY SOCIETY: Rev. Ida C. Hultin.

Davenport — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. Arthur M. Judy, Mrs. Clarice Bills.

Des Moines — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: J. M. Hunting, John C. Leonard.

Sioux City — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. Mary A. Safford, Mrs. Lucy B. Booge, Mrs. E. H. Buckman.

MICHIGAN.

Ann Arbor — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. T. Sunderland, Prof. Wm. H. Pettee, Rev. James T. Bixby.

Hosted by Google

Detroit — FIRST CONGREGATIONAL UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Jesse H. Farwell, Jacob Hull, A. A. Ballou.

Grand Rapids — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. J. E. Roberts, Mrs. D. M Benjamin, Mrs. L. D. Putnam.

THE LIBERAL HOLLAND CHURCH: Rev. F. W. H. Hugenholtz.

Jackson — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Charles F. Elliott, Mr. and Mrs. H. W. Smith.

Manistee — THE UNITARAN CHURCH: Rev. Albert Walkley, Simeon Babcock, T. J. Ramsdell.

Midland City — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. L. R. Daniels, Wm. Patrick.

KENTUCKY.

Louisville — CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH: Rev. C. J. K. Jones, A. J. Munn, Mrs. Amelia Cornwall.

WISCONSIN.

Madison — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. J. H. Crooker, Miss A. A. Woodward, Miss Ella A. Gillis.

Milwaukee — THE UNITARIAN CHURCH: Rev. T. B. Forbush, Mrs. J. C. Coleman, Mrs. T. B. Forbush.

MINNESOTA.

Minneapolis — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. H. M. Simmons, Mary E. Hale.

St. Paul — UNITY CHURCH: Mrs. Charles H. Clark, Mrs. Edward Sawyer.

KANSAS.

Lawrence — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. C. G. Howland, Mrs. S. M. H. Gardner, O. E. Learnard.

Topeka — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Enoch Powell.

MISSOURI.

St. Louis — CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH: Rev. John Snyder, John E. McKeighan, J. Gilbert Chapman.

COLORADO.

Denver — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. Thomas Van Ness, Henry C. Dillon, Mrs. Van Ness.

CALIFORNIA.

Santa Barbara — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Rev. A. W. Jackson, Mr. and Mrs. F. H. Knight.

San Francisco — FIRST UNITARIAN SOCIETY: Mark Sheldon, Arthur A. Smith, Mrs. S. L. Bee.

CANADA.

Montreal — CHURCH OF THE MESSIAH: Rev. W. S. Barnes, T. Sterry Hunt, Alexander Manson.

Toronto — FIRST UNITARIAN CHURCH: Dr. George Kennedy, George M. Rose.

ASSOCIATIONS, Etc.

American Unitarian Association: Hon. George D. Robinson, Rev. Grindall Reynolds, Charles H. Burrage.

Benevolent Fraternity of Churches of Boston: Thomas Gaffield, Wm. H. Kennard, John Capen.

Boston Association: Rev. H. H. Woude.

Association of Ministers in and about Cambridge: Rev. John A. Buckingham.

Cape Cod Conference: Mr. and Mrs. S. B. Phinney, Miss Susan Starbuck.

Channing Club (Chicago): Andrew Crawford, John A. Roche, Rev. E. I. Galvin.

Channing Conference: Rev. D. W. Stevens, Joseph Buckminster, Nathan H. Skinner.

Children's Mission, Boston: William H. Baldwin, Samuel B. Cruft, William Crosby.

Christian Register Association: Arthur T. Lyman, Rev. Samuel J. Barrows, Geo. H. Ellis.

Connecticut Valley Conference: J. R. Smith, Stephen Barker, Rev. J. F. Moors, D.D.

Essex Conference: Hon. N. A. Horton, Prof. M. H. Hawley, Mrs. Hawley.

Evangelical Missionary Society: Rev. A. P. Peabody, D.D., Rev. Henry W. Foote, Rev. Henry F. Jenks.

Illinois Conference: Hon. Charles Bennett, Mrs. S. C. Ll. Jones, Mrs. J. R. Effinger.

Industrial School for Girls, Dorchester: Miss Mary L. Hall.

Iowa Association: Rev. Oscar Clute, Rev. S. S. Hunting, Mrs. C. T. Cole.

May Ministerial Conference: Rev. S. R. Calthrop, Rev. N. M. Mann, Rev. George W. Cutter.

Meadville Theological School: Rev. A. A. Livermore, Miss E. G. Huidekoper, F. H. Bemis.

Michigan Conference: Rev. Edw. P. Gibbs, Rev. Rowland Connor, N. B. Hall.

New Hampshire Unitarian Association: Daniel Barnard, Joseph Farnum, Miss Harriet Gale.

New Hampshire Unitarian Educational Society: J. C. A. Hill, Mrs. C. S. Faulkner, Mrs. R. C. Carr.

Norfolk Conference: Richard C. Humphreys, Francis B. Snow, Helen G. Putnam.

Norfolk and Middlesex Ministerial Association: Rev. Charles C. Sewall, Rev. William O. White.

North Middlesex Conference: John F. Kimball, Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Blanchard.

Plymouth and Bay Association of Sunday School Teachers: Dr. H. H. Filoon, I. N. Nutter, William C. Bates.

Plymouth and Bay Conference: Hon. John D. Long, Hon. A. A. Gilmore, Frank H. Holmes, Esq.

South End Industrial School: Mrs. J. W. Andrews, Mrs. John G. Wetherell.

Southern Conference: Alva Gage, William Palfrey, J. A. Burns.

South Middlesex Conference: Carroll

Hosted by Google

D. Wright, Thatcher Magoun, Rev. William Brunton.

The Unitarian Club (Boston): Hon. John Lowell, Dr. Benjamin Apthorp Gould, Henry H. Edes.

Unitarian Educational Society of New Hampshire: J. C. A. Hill.

Unitarian Ministers' Monday Club: Rev. Henry H. Woude, Rev. Joseph H. Allen, Rev. George Batchelor.

Unitarian Sunday School Society: John W. Porter, Rev. Henry G. Spaulding, Elizabeth P. Channing.

Unitarian Sunday School Union: Louis P. Hollander, Henry F. Howe, Gertrude T. Jacobs.

Western Unitarian Association: Hon. George W. McCrary, H. T. Thompson, Joseph Shippen.

Western Unitarian Conference: D. L. Shorey, C. J. Richardson, Rev. J. R. Effinger.

Western Unitarian Sunday School Society: Rev. J. V. Blake, Mrs. Ellen T. Leonard, Miss M. E. French.

Wisconsin Conference: Rev. T. B. Forbush, Hon. H. H. Giles, Rev. J. H. Crooker.

Women's Auxiliary Conference: Miss Abby W. May, Mrs. G. W. Thacher, Miss F. L. Close.

Women's Auxiliary Conference (Wilmington, Del.): Mrs. George W. Stone.

Women's Western Unitarian Conference: Miss Frances Le Baron, Mrs. S. S. Hunting, Mrs. E. A. West.

Worcester Conference: William Knowlton, Charles Field, B. F. Wallis.

Worcester Ministerial Association: Rev. Julius Blass, Rev. Austin S. Garver, Rev. George S. Ball.

Worcester Sunday School Society: Benjamin F. Wallace.

Worcester West Ministerial Association: Mrs. A. F. Bailey, Mrs. G. F. Clark.

Hosted by Google

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
3 9015 06827 6891

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google

Hosted by Google